

20031204.qrp v03\_n124.qrl.20031204

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 19:03:14 EST  
From: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: QRP-L digest 3124

QRP-L Digest 3124

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) [162288] FS DSW-20 II  
by "ross bell" <rossbell@commspeed.net>
- 2) [162289] Elecraft XG1 Receiver Test Oscillator/S-Meter Calibrator  
by Wayne Burdick <n6kr@elecraft.com>
- 3) [162290] Re: [Elecraft] Elecraft XG1 Receiver Test Oscillator/S-Meter  
Calibrator  
by Eric Swartz WA6HHQ - Elecraft <eric@elecraft.com>
- 4) [162291] FOX: Log of the Low Fox K5DI  
by Karl Larsen <k5di@zianet.com>
- 5) [162292] 160 meter test  
by "Fred \((VE3FAL\)" <flesnick@tbaytel.net>
- 6) [162293] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
by "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>
- 7) [162294] Cable Modem Interference  
by "W. Keith Hibbert" <wkhibbert@frontiernet.net>
- 8) [162295] ET phone home!  
by "tmyers" <tmyers@academicplanet.com>
- 9) [162296] Re: Many sources of analog panel meters / Answers on Ten Tec SWR  
meter sensors  
by "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>
- 10) [162297] NEQRP CW Net, Thursday, 4 Dec 03, 08:30 PM EST, 3.566 MHz  
by Chuck Ludinsky <cludinsky@comcast.net>
- 11) [162298] I'm Hungry  
by "Jerry Ford" <benlightnd13@mcchsi.com>
- 12) [162299] Re: ET phone home!  
by Nick Yokanovich <k3ny@cablespeed.com>
- 13) [162300] RE: Part Source  
by "JAKidz" <jakidz@pullman.com>
- 14) [162301] FOX: Preliminary Log of KV2X fox V1.0000000  
by tjennin2@rochester.rr.com
- 15) [162302] Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
by "Bruce Prior" <n7rr@hotmail.com>
- 16) [162303] Re: [azqrp] AZ ScQRPion List  
by "Floyd Smithberg" <nq7x@earthlink.net>
- 17) [162304] Re: Cable Modem Interference  
by Thom LaCosta <baltimoremd@baltimoremd.com>
- 18) [162305] Looking for a KD1JV "0-10 Watt RMS RF Power Meter Kit"

- by "Meier, Peter H." <peter.meier@unisys.com>
- 19) [162306] Re: Cable Modem Interference  
by wd8civ@att.net
  - 20) [162307] December Spartan Sprint Results  
by "John Huffman" <hjohnc@core.com>
  - 21) [162308] Why have mono phone plugs and cables?  
by Kenneth Cooperstein <cprstn54@att.net>
  - 22) [162309] FS: KK7B MINI R2 RECEIVERS  
by "Donald Dorn" <DDORN@CWIS.NET>
  - 23) [162310] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
by "n2cx" <n2cx@voicenet.com>
  - 24) [162311] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
by "n2cx" <n2cx@voicenet.com>
  - 25) [162312] AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by Jerry Haigwood <w5jh@swlink.net>
  - 26) [162313] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>
  - 27) [162314] Re: Why have mono phone plugs and cables?  
by wd8civ@att.net
  - 28) [162315] The TOP 100 list is posted  
by "Joe Martin" <km5cw@wt.net>
  - 29) [162316] Re: Cable Modem Interference  
by "carl seyersdahl" <carlseye@tampabay.rr.com>
  - 30) [162317] MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
by "Pat Armstrong" <aa7fg@gte.net>
  - 31) [162318] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
by "Michael Melland, W9WIS" <w9wis@charter.net>
  - 32) [162319] Re: KK7B MINI R2 RECEIVERS  
by "Donald Dorn" <DDORN@CWIS.NET>
  - 33) [162320] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
by Chuck Carpenter <w5usj@9plus.net>
  - 34) [162321] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
by "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>
  - 35) [162322] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by Lee Mairs <lmairs@direcway.com>
  - 36) [162323] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by Lee Mairs <lmairs@direcway.com>
  - 37) [162324] Re: [fpqrp] RUN FOR THE BACON  
by "Jerry Ford" <benlightnd13@mchsi.com>
  - 38) [162325] RE: L-1682B1J Availability Last Bite  
by Davewb4@aol.com
  - 39) [162326] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
by "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>
  - 40) [162327] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
by "Rod N0RC" <rc7039-hr@yahoo.com>
  - 41) [162328] Fw: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
by "Rod N0RC" <rc7039-hr@yahoo.com>
  - 42) [162329] Re: ET phone home!

- by Garie Halstead K8KFJ <khyberpass65@yahoo.com>
- 43) [162330] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by Jerry Haigwood <w5jh@swlink.net>
- 44) [162331] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>
- 45) [162332] Re: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
by Wayne Burdick <n6kr@elecraft.com>
- 46) [162333] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
by "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>
- 47) [162334] RE: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
by "Mark Rauchfuss" <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>
- 48) [162335] Re: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
by Wayne Burdick <n6kr@elecraft.com>
- 49) [162336] Iowa QRP Club CW Net  
by Mark Milburn <mark.milburn@ispwest.com>
- 50) [162337] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
- 51) [162338] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by John Sielke <jsielke@pobox.com>
- 52) [162339] Unmitigated Self-Aggrandizment  
by John Sielke <jsielke@pobox.com>
- 53) [162340] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by Chuck Adams <k7qo@commspeed.net>
- 54) [162341] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>
- 55) [162342] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
- 56) [162343] I Need a DL34M 4 digit LED display!  
by "Michael Pupeza" <mpupeza@sympatico.ca>
- 57) [162344] RE: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
by "Mark Rauchfuss" <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>
- 58) [162345] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
by "Michael Melland, W9WIS" <w9wis@charter.net>
- 59) [162346] RE: [Elecraft] Orion added to Elecraft rig RX comparison page  
by "Hare,Ed, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.org>
- 60) [162347] RE: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"  
by "Hare,Ed, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.org>
- 61) [162348] OT: Cable Modem Interference  
by "Goody K3NG" <k3ng@qrpis.org>
- 62) [162349] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "Brian.Buydens@usask.ca" <buydens@duke.usask.ca>
- 63) [162350] Antenna Compendium Vol 3  
by "M.M." <markem@cox.net>
- 64) [162351] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "Mark Rauchfuss" <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>
- 65) [162352] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>
- 66) [162353] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers

by "Andreas Junge - ARRL.NET" <n6nu@arrl.net>  
67) [162354] RE: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"  
by "Mark Rauchfuss" <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>  
68) [162355] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>  
69) [162356] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
70) [162357] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>  
71) [162358] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>  
72) [162359] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
73) [162360] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
by Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>  
74) [162361] PSK31 on PDA Device?  
by <k6whp@verizon.net>  
75) [162362] Paddle making hints  
by Karl Larsen <k5di@zianet.com>  
76) [162363] VLF simple receiver, was ET phone home  
by "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>  
77) [162364] RE: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
by "Lyle Johnson" <wa7gxd@fidalgo.net>  
78) [162365] Looking for an old Handbook cd to send to a new friend  
by w2bvh <w2bvh@comcast.net>  
79) [162366] RE: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by "Paul Womble" <pwomble@earthlink.net>  
80) [162367] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by "Tim Kass" <timkass@hotmail.com>  
81) [162368] Re: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
by "Bill Smith" <billsmith@ispwest.com>  
82) [162369] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by Thom LaCosta <baltimoremd@baltimoremd.com>  
83) [162370] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by "richqrp" <richqrp@cox.net>  
84) [162371] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
by Barry Minsky <barry@w2bj.com>  
85) [162372] RE: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
by "Lyle Johnson" <wa7gxd@fidalgo.net>

---

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 16:31:22 -0700  
From: "ross bell" <rossbell@commspeed.net>  
To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162288] FS DSW-20 II  
Message-ID: <001f01c3b9f5\$9005c850\$182c13d8@bellfamily>  
MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Already built DSW-20 II looks and works includes the jackon pic chip latest revision. \$150.00 shipping included

Ross - K7RSB

-----  
Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 16:01:58 -0800  
From: Wayne Burdick <n6kr@elecraft.com>  
To: Elecraft <elecraft@mailman.qth.net>, qrp <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162289] Elecraft XG1 Receiver Test Oscillator/S-Meter Calibrator  
Message-ID: <3FCE7976.74E21940@elecraft.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ever wonder how well an HF receiver is really working--or how one receiver compares to another? One of the most important performance measurements is sensitivity. But measuring sensitivity (MDS or signal-to-noise ratio) usually requires an expensive, lab-grade signal generator.

At just \$39, our new XG1 Receiver Test Oscillator is an inexpensive alternative. The XG1 is a fixed-frequency (7.040 MHz) signal source with highly-accurate 1 microvolt and 50 microvolt output levels. Thanks to its precision, low-level crystal oscillator, the XG1 achieves absolute output accuracy of better than +/- 2 dB, and extremely small unit-to-unit variation of typically +/- 1 dB. This ensures that measurements made with different XG1s can be compared, which can be helpful when evaluating used equipment found at flea markets or on the web.

The 1-microvolt level can be used to determine a receiver's MDS (minimum discernable signal), as well as its overall receive gain. 50 microvolts is widely used as the standard "S9" reference, so this level can be used for S-meter calibration. Step-by-step procedures are included for receiver performance measurement and S-meter alignment.

Additional features of the XG1 include an on-board 3-volt battery (standard coin cell), low-battery LED (yellow), power-on LED (green), and reverse-transmit warning LED (red). The unit is protected against brief accidental transmit, and has been tested at up to 10 watts for 2 seconds. But the provided test procedures include warnings about disconnecting the key, mic, etc., so accidental transmit into the XG1 is unlikely.

An output frequency of 7040 kHz was selected because nearly all multi-band HF

transceivers, as well as many monoband transceivers, cover the 40 meter CW band. But the XG1 also provides reduced output levels at harmonics of 7040 kHz, so it can be used for receiver alignment and qualitative tests on 20, 15, and 10 meters.

Since the oscillator itself puts only 10 nanowatts, the unit requires no enclosure and no interstage shielding. Careful PC board layout and component selection ensure that RF leakage is virtually eliminated. Assembly takes only about an hour, and the only alignment step--which is optional--is fine-tuning the frequency of the crystal oscillator while listening on a calibrated receiver.

The XG1 is the fourth in our series of easy-to-build mini-module kits, which can be seen at:

[http://www.elecrafter.com/elecrafter\\_prod\\_list.htm](http://www.elecrafter.com/elecrafter_prod_list.htm)

Like our other mini-modules, the XG1 is quite small: the PC board is just 1.5"W by 3.5"L. You can use a BNC male-to-male adapter such as our #BNC-MM to eliminate the coax cable and directly connect the XG1 to the back of a receiver or transceiver. Stick-on rubber feet are also included so the unit can be used on your work bench.

The XG1 will begin shipping on or before December 12th.

73,  
Wayne, N6KR  
Eric, WA6HHQ

--

<http://www.elecrafter.com>

-----  
Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 17:00:42 -0800  
From: Eric Swartz WA6HHQ - Elecraft <eric@elecraft.com>  
To: Elecraft <elecraft@mailman.qth.net>  
Cc: qrp <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162290] Re: [Elecraft] Elecraft XG1 Receiver Test Oscillator/S-Meter Calibrator  
Message-ID: <3FCE873A.9010003@elecraft.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The correct link for our Mini-Modules page, which includes the XG1, is:

[http://www.elecrafter.com/mini\\_module\\_kits/mini\\_modules.htm](http://www.elecrafter.com/mini_module_kits/mini_modules.htm)

: -)

73, Eric WA6HHQ

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 18:19:00 -0700 (MST)  
From: Karl Larsen <k5di@zianet.com>  
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu  
Subject: [162291] FOX: Log of the Low Fox K5DI  
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0312031818110.4697-100000@bucket.dog>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Log of Karl K5DI, Low Fox on December 2 evening. Things were fine until the flare hit the earth.

Please send me any errors you would like corrected. I have been Fox 2 times last year and I do make a lot of errors. Sorry.

| Time | Call  | Report             |
|------|-------|--------------------|
| 0202 | N9NE  | 559 WI TODD 5W     |
| 0205 | W5TB  | 559 TX DOC 5W      |
| 0206 | N1FN  | 559 CO ET 5W       |
| 0207 | KL7V  | 559 OK SAM 5W      |
| 0208 | N0UR  | 579 MN JIM 5W      |
| 0209 | K5JHP | 559 TX BILL 5W     |
| 0210 | KT5V  | 559 TX DAVID 5W    |
| 0211 | K3PH  | 559 PA BOB 5W      |
| 0212 | K5OI  | 559 OK TIM 5W      |
| 0213 | W9XU  | 559 WI LON 5W      |
| 0214 | W5YR  | 559 TX GEORGE 5W   |
| 0215 | N0EA  | 559 MO WAYNE 5W    |
| 0216 | W9XT  | 559 WI GARY 5W     |
| 0217 | KI0II | 559 CO RON 5W      |
| 0218 | N0DT  | 559 MO DAN 5W      |
| 0219 | W9TZE | 559 WI JIM 5W      |
| 0220 | N0TK  | 559 CO DAN 5W      |
| 0221 | W0CH  | 559 MO DAVE 900 MW |
| 0222 | AC5JH | 559 OK TOM 5W      |
| 0225 | N4ROA | 559 VA DAN 5W      |
| 0226 | N9AU  | 559 WI RON 5W      |

|      |        |               |    |      |
|------|--------|---------------|----|------|
| 0227 | K3ESE  | 559 MD LLOYD  | 5W |      |
| 0229 | W0UFO  | 559 MN MERT   | 5W |      |
| 0230 | W6ZYY  | 559 MD CURT   | 5W |      |
| 0231 | K5EAD  | 559 LA WAYNE  | 5W |      |
| 0232 | K2ZN   | 559 NY AL     | 5W |      |
| 0233 | NK6A   | 559 CA DON    | 5W |      |
| 0235 | N0JRN  | 559 MO JERRY  | 5W |      |
| 0236 | NA50   | 559 LA VERN   | 5W |      |
| 0237 | N1TP   | 559 FL TOM    | 5W |      |
| 0238 | AJ4AY  | 559 AL JAY    | 5W |      |
| 0239 | K6VNX  | 559 CA ARLEN  | 5W |      |
| 0242 | N9AW   | 559 WI JERRY  | 5W |      |
| 0244 | K6XR   | 559 CA REGGIE | 5W |      |
| 0245 | KD5UDB | 559 LA CHRIS  | 5W |      |
| 0246 | N3GOV  | 559 MD STEVE  | 5W |      |
| 0247 | N9KW   | 559 IL JOHN   | 5W |      |
| 0248 | N4DD   | 559 TN DENNIS | 5W |      |
| 0251 | W4FOA  | 579 GA TONY   | 5W |      |
| 0252 | N5IB   | 559 LA JIM    | 5W |      |
| 0254 | N3BJ   | 559 VA ALAN   | 5W |      |
| 0255 | K9IS   | 559 WI STEVE  | 5W |      |
| 0300 | KB9YIG | 559 IN TONY   | 5W |      |
| 0307 | AF4PP  | 559 GA CHUCK  | 5W |      |
| 0310 | NV4V   | 559 KY PETE   | 5W |      |
| 0312 | K9NX   | 559 IND TIM   | 5W |      |
| 0320 | WB8BHG | 559 WI LEE    | 5W |      |
| 0324 | WB8BXN | 559 OH MIKE   | 5W |      |
| 0325 | AG0T   | 559 ND TODD   | 5W |      |
| 0336 | K7TQ   | 559 ID RANDY  | 5W |      |
| 0340 | NK9G   | 559 WI RICK   | 5W |      |
| 0341 | KD5UDB | 559 LA CHRIS  | 5W | DUPE |
| 0344 | WA9TZE | 559 WI JIM    | 5W |      |
| 0345 | AB9CA  | 559 AL DAVE   | 5W |      |
| 0347 | W9HL   | 559 IL RANDY  | 5W |      |
| 0348 | K9DI   | 559 IL WAYNE  | 5W |      |
| 0400 | K5DI   | KARL FOX      |    |      |
| 0400 | KV2X   | TOM FOX       |    |      |

--

- Karl Larsen k5di Las Cruces,NM Az ScQRPions -

-----

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 21:45:44 -0500  
 From: "Fred \((VE3FAL\)" <flesnick@tbaytel.net>



To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162292] 160 meter test  
Message-ID: <018301c3ba10\$b71b7960\$e405d3d8@flesnick>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well worked 4 folks on 160 in the test tonight:

N9NE  
KF9D  
K7RE  
K9FO

And at 0244 they are the only folks with readable workable signals, will need to wait a while before others peak up.

Fred  
VE3FAL

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 21:01:16 -0600  
From: "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>  
To: <khyberpass65@yahoo.com>, <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162293] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
Message-ID: <000301c3ba12\$e2453570\$4e100a0a@rohredt2000>

When I was teaching electronics in 9M2 land, (W. Malaysia), in 1966, we copied one of the Navy VLF stations on about 20 kHz with a receiver built from one of the lab demo kits. This was a kit similar, or perhaps by Canadian Heath Co.

What I remember was the local oscillator was a flip flop of two transistors, and maybe there was a third transistor as the mixer/ detector, and we ran the detected audio out to a lab amplifier. I remember we copied the CW just fine. And this was across the Pacific and in the area of the E. edge of the Indian Ocean. Antenna was 30 feet of hook up wire run about 10 feet high inside the outer wall of the lab in a masonry building.

Those 1 or 2 million watt signals really get out!  
Does anyone remember the exact circuit of the receiver using the flip flop oscillator?  
I would like to replicate that experimental set up, but any notes have escaped me after 37 years!

Thanks for the memory and 72,  
Stuart  
K5KVH

-----  
Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 22:11:38 -0500  
From: "W. Keith Hibbert" <wkhibbert@frontiernet.net>  
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu  
Subject: [162294] Cable Modem Interference  
Message-ID: <5.1.0.14.0.20031203220133.009e7040@pop3.frontiernet.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Hi. Keith here in the Depths of the Great Bergen Swamp

I had the oddest experience today, I found out that my QRP 10-Meter beacon is disrupting the local Road Runner service.

I got a visitor from Time-Warner about 1130 local. He had a portable RX with him and asked if I was a ham. I confirmed this, then he asked if I had any equipment on the air on or near 28.3 MHz. I told him yes, and it was the beacon I ran under the local club call, actually on 28.2873 MHz.

Well, it seems that the beacon has been causing a problem with packet dropout and loss of connectivity on the Road Runner system over most of the village. Now, this was alarming as I had a picture in my mind of Time-Warner trying to get me off the air, or something. The tech went on to say that the cable modems in this system have a center frequency of 29 MHz and the beacon signal fell within the "nominal" bandwidth.

Then he said, "You have everything running OK, the problem is ingress due to a loose connector or broken line." At that point he indicated that they would be checking all of the cable TV boxes and cable modems in my half of town to find the problem.

I have to say, the level of training evident from this conversation was refreshing. Also, the tech's familiarity with the regs and recognizing ingress to be their problem, not mine, was a bit of a surprise.

Now, why did they pick 10-Meters to run Road Runner???

73, Keith, WB2VU0, Trustee of the NQ2RP/B 10-Meter Beacon  
28.2873 MHz on Your Radio Dial - 24/7

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 03:20:45 -0600  
From: "tmyers" <tmyers@academicplanet.com>  
To: "QRP-L Post" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162295] ET phone home!  
Message-ID: <000b01c3ba47\$e75a3940\$1700a8c0@newkid>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I did a little looking on the net and found a couple of good sites to  
whet your appetites on the VLF stuff.

<<http://www.archive.org/movies/details-db.php?collection=prelinger&collectionid=navyxmtr>>

<<http://cryptome.org/jcrs-eyeball.htm>>

<<http://www.cmsstudios.com/fly2k/03flights/042703.htm>>

<<http://mail.gnu.org/archive/html/discuss-gnuradio/2003-03/msg00019.html>  
> Sound Samples

<<http://www.itu.int/ITU-R/study-groups/rsg7/docs/768e.doc>>

The VLF station at Cutler Mane and the Jim Creek station are sister  
stations, but I think the antenna at Jim Creek is one of the highest in  
the system as it is strung between two mountain tops and it is BIG.

Try some goggle searches like: "Jim Creek" Washington or "Jim Creek"  
radio or "Jim Creek" antenna and you will find a lot more stuff on VLF  
and sub activities. I found lots of information I didn't even think  
would be on the net about VLF. They even have frequencies posted.

Have fun and learn more than you ever wanted to know about VLF sites.

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 21:31:02 -0600  
From: "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>  
To: <jhs001@heronetwork.com>, <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [162296] Re: Many sources of analog panel meters / Answers on Ten Tec SWR meter sensors

Message-ID: <000701c3ba17\$0ad9b5c0\$4e100a0a@rohredt2000>

Jason,

If you get back issues of QRP ARCI Quarterly to Fall 96 I believe; you can read my review article on the Ten Tec Wattmeter Kit.

Briefly, there is a Stockton style, (RF core transformer), pick up for the HF SWR and power, and a strip line pick up for the VHF/UHF side. There are two amplifiers, going to the common -to -both meter. Scales are provided for directly reading SWR or Power depending on switch selection. Went together well, and worked first time. Very easy on batteries, I think only the second one is in there, and only because I left the thing on all field day weekend and then in the carrying box coming home. I did not take it out to hook into the station as I have SWR meters built into my main rigs, and so did not notice the switch on for awhile.

On those analog meters, Ten Tec still uses them widely, as do others in the music trade. I think they will be around awhile, and I imagine that you can get a good price if you buy a lot of 500 from Chinese manufacturers. There are also a lot made in Taiwan if memory serves.

-Stuart Rohre  
K5KVH

-----  
Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 22:38:25 -0500  
From: Chuck Ludinsky <cludinsky@comcast.net>  
To: neqrp@jona1.net, qrp-1@lehigh.edu  
Subject: [162297] NEQRP CW Net, Thursday, 4 Dec 03, 08:30 PM EST, 3.566 MHz  
Message-ID: <3FCEAC31.1050801@comcast.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The New England QRP Club's 80M CW net, WQ1RP, will meet again on Thursday, 4 December 2003, at 8:30 PM EST (01:30Z, 5 Dec 03) on or near 3.566 MHz. All hams are welcome. Net control operator will be Chuck, K1CL, operating from Chelmsford, MA.

There was no net last week. Hope everyone had a happy and safe Thanksgiving. Looking forward to hearing you all again this week.

72 DE K1CL,

Chuck

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 20:51:13 -0600  
From: "Jerry Ford" <benlightnd13@mchsi.com>  
To: "qrp-1" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>, "FPigs" <fpqrp-1@mpna.com>  
Subject: [162298] I'm Hungry  
Message-ID: <00ab01c3ba11\$7b45fae0\$4a78da0c@mchsi.com>

OK piggies:

Just a note to say thanks very much to those of you that stopped by  
freq tonight. It was great to hear so many of you get in there and  
mix it up. Ton's of fun and works real well to take my mind off  
some other things.

Just the medicine I needed !!

So now, for the rest of the story !!!! LOL

Anyone still around that wants to chew the fat at bit??

7044 be there or be square !!

72 oo Jerry N0JRN

FP # 546, 4SQRP, ARS # 923, ARCI # 11049, ARRL,  
Springfield, Mo. MP + #8  
<http://home.mchsi.com/~n0jrn>

-----  
Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2003 23:17:45 -0500  
From: Nick Yokanovich <k3ny@cablespeed.com>  
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162299] Re: ET phone home!  
Message-ID: <3FCEB569.2010502@cablespeed.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

NSS was the callsign of the Navy's Radio Transmitter Facility at Annapolis, MD. The station was in operation from 1918 to 1996. I live nearby and was lucky to get a tour of the station in 1998, before it was completely demolished. (Most of the transmitter parts were sent to Cutler and Jim Creek. There are great pictures on Jim Hawkins' web site at <http://hawkins.pair.com/nss.shtml> -- the size of the components is staggering! Plug "NSS Annapolis" into your browser for several very informative sites about NSS.

73

Nick K3NY  
Arnold, MD

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 20:39:43 -0800  
From: "JAKidz" <jakidz@pullman.com>  
To: <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162300] RE: Part Source  
Message-ID: <000001c3ba20\$a40337e0\$2fb57e40@jmgay>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
                charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> I need a Microtemp TCO (temperature cutoff) or similar in the  
> 110 C range, 15A 125V.

FWIW, found one ("thermal" rather than "temperature") - Mouser  
526-NTE8108.

John, K7JG.

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 00:02:06 -0500  
From: tjennin2@rochester.rr.com  
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU  
Subject: [162301] FOX: Preliminary Log of KV2X fox V1.0000000  
Message-ID: <3FCE797E.11547.BCCFAD9@localhost>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
Content-description: Mail message body

Hi Hounds!

Here is my log as promised but a little late in the day!!!  
 Looks like only one dup this time and is marked as such.  
 I noticed that the Hound population is growing in CO.  
 Please send me corrections. There was a lot of qsb so  
 there may have been a few dits and dahs dropped.

Thanks again for you all "hounding" me and I hope to  
 pass a pelt to those who missed out next time.

| UTC  | Call  | RST | SPC | Name   | Power |
|------|-------|-----|-----|--------|-------|
| 2101 | K0UU  | 559 | MN  | JEFF   | 5     |
| 2102 | N1FN  | 559 | CO  | ET     | 5     |
| 2102 | N0UR  | 579 | MN  | JIM    | 5     |
| 2103 | K0EVZ | 559 | NM  | DOC    | 5     |
| 2104 | N0EA  | 559 | MO  | WAYNE  | 5     |
| 2105 | N0DT  | 559 | MO  | DAN    | 4     |
| 2105 | AG0T  | 559 | ND  | TODD   | 5     |
| 2108 | AJ4AY | 559 | AL  | JAY    | 5     |
| 2109 | N0JRN | 559 | MO  | JERRY  | 5     |
| 2110 | KI0II | 599 | CO  | RON    | 5     |
| 2111 | N0TK  | 579 | CO  | DAN    | 5     |
| 2113 | W0CH  | 579 | MO  | DAVE   | 5     |
| 2113 | K2ZN  | 569 | NY  | AL     | 5     |
| 2114 | W5HNS | 559 | TX  | HENRY  | 5     |
| 2116 | VA6RF | 559 | AB  | EARL   | 5     |
| 2117 | W0UFO | 559 | MN  | MERT   | 5     |
| 2118 | KT5V  | 559 | TX  | DAVE   | 5     |
| 2121 | W5YR  | 559 | TX  | GEORGE | 5     |
| 2123 | KK5LD | 559 | TX  | DAN    | 5     |
| 2124 | KL7V  | 539 | OK  | SAM    | 5     |
| 2126 | AB5XQ | 559 | AR  | BILL   | 5     |
| 2126 | K5JHP | 559 | TX  | BILL   | 5     |
| 2127 | AC5JH | 559 | OK  | TOM    | 5     |
| 2129 | AK7Y  | 559 | AZ  | GREG   | 5     |
| 2129 | AA50  | 559 | LA  | VERN   | 5     |
| 2131 | N1TP  | 559 | FL  | TOM    | 5     |
| 2132 | K6VNX | 459 | CA  | ARLEN  | 5     |
| 2134 | K2TER | 559 | NY  | BILL   | 5     |
| 2135 | K5EOA | 559 | LA  | WAYNE  | 5     |
| 2136 | W5TN  | 559 | TX  | DOC    | 5     |
| 2137 | AC7A  | 559 | AZ  | TOM    | 5     |
| 2138 | K50I  | 559 | OK  | TIM    | 5     |
| 2139 | AG4PJ | 559 | AL  | DAVE   | 5     |
| 2140 | N5IB  | 559 | LA  | JIM    | 5     |
| 2140 | N5ZE  | 559 | TX  | LEW    | 5     |
| 2142 | N5YFC | 559 | LA  | WAYNE  | 5     |
| 2146 | K9DI  | 559 | IL  | WAYNE  | 5     |

|      |        |     |    |        |     |          |
|------|--------|-----|----|--------|-----|----------|
| 2148 | KD5UDB | 559 | LA | CHRIS  | 5   |          |
| 2154 | AK5X   | 569 | TX | BILL   | 5   |          |
| 2155 | W4FOA  | 559 | GA | TONY   | 5   |          |
| 2158 | K6XR   | 559 | CA | REGGIE | 5   |          |
| 2200 | K5ZTY  | 559 | TX | BILL   | 5   |          |
| 2202 | KG0PP  | 559 | CO | JIM    | 5   |          |
| 2204 | NK0E   | 559 | CO | DAVE   | 5   |          |
| 2205 | VE5RC  | 229 | SK | BRUCE  | 5   |          |
| 2208 | NN5E   | 559 | TX | VERN   | 5   |          |
| 2213 | KD5CMN | 559 | TX | MIKE   | 5   |          |
| 2215 | K5DW   | 559 | TX | DON    | 5   |          |
| 2215 | W9XT   | 559 | WI | GARY   | 5   |          |
| 2218 | N9AU   | 559 | WI | RON    | 5   |          |
| 2222 | N0HRL  | 559 | IA | KEN    | 5   |          |
| 2225 | N9AW   | 559 | WI | JERRY  | 5   |          |
| 2226 | WA9TZE | 579 | WI | JIM    | 5   |          |
| 2227 | NK9G   | 559 | WI | RICK   | 5   |          |
| 2230 | W0PWE  | 559 | IA | JERRY  | 5   |          |
| 2230 | W9HL   | 559 | IL | RANDY  | 5   |          |
| 2232 | W0ANM  | 559 | MN | CHRIS  | 5   |          |
| 2233 | KD5UDB | 559 | LA | CHRIS  | 5   | <--- DUP |
| 2234 | AB9CA  | 559 | AL | DAVE   | 5   |          |
| 2237 | AB0CD  | 559 | CO | DICK   | 5   |          |
| 2240 | W0MPR  | 559 | CO | GREGG  | 5   |          |
| 2241 | AA5TA  | 559 | TX | LARRY  | 5   |          |
| 2242 | K5TR   | 559 | TX | GEORGE | 5   |          |
| 2243 | WA8ZBT | 559 | TX | DENNIS | 5   |          |
| 2244 | W5TB   | 559 | TX | DOC    | 5   |          |
| 2249 | KR0U   | 559 | CO | TIM    | 5   |          |
| 2251 | KI0RB  | 599 | CO | VINCE  | 5   |          |
| 2254 | KB5FCF | 559 | OK | JOEL   | 4   |          |
| 2255 | K0LOA  | 559 | TX | DWAIN  | 5   |          |
| 0400 | K5DI   |     | NM | KARL   | FOX |          |
| 0400 | KV2X   |     | NY | TOM    | FOX |          |

-----

Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 06:32:06 +0000  
From: "Bruce Prior" <n7rr@hotmail.com>  
To: unlisted-recipients;; (no To-header on input)  
Subject: [162302] Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
Message-ID: <BAY1-F580A0Ch8qKLyc0000768a@hotmail.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

The KX1, especially with the KXB30 installed, makes an excellent shortwave receiver with the bandpass filter at its widest setting.



Double sideband AM transmissions can be detected by zero-beating in LSB or USB modes. If tuned to the 40 m band, reception is possible from 5.0 to 9.505 MHz; the 30 m band yields a range from 8.0 to 12.505 MHz; the 20 m band allows shortwave tuning from 12.0 to 16.505 MHz. (The USB mode employs the better filter shape for the highest band.) Since most shortwave broadcast stations transmit on frequencies evenly divisible by 5 kHz, the very coarse 5 kHz/step tuning speed makes tuning convenient. To calibrate the steps properly in LSB or USB modes, begin in the finest tuning speed and tune until 0.00 or 5.00 is displayed, then push and hold the encoder knob until the decimal marker disappears. The entire 4.505 MHz range can be covered in 11 rotations of the tuning encoder.

In addition to shortwave broadcasting, there's lots more to listen to outside of the amateur bands with the KX1. For example, USB commercial aviation covering the Atlantic and/or Arctic Oceans can be heard on 5565, 5598, 5616, 5649, 6535, 8825, 8861, 8864, 8879, 8891, 11 279, 11 291, 13 291, 13 315, and 13 357 kHz. Caribbean USB aviation is on 5520, 5555, 6577, 6586, 8846, 8918, 11 387, and 11 396 kHz. Pacific Ocean USB aviation communications are on 5547, 5574, 5628, 5643, 6532, 6562, 8843, 8867, 10 048, 11 282, 11 330, 11 384, 13 300, 13 336, and 13 354 kHz. The aviation channels are open frequencies which are not constantly active: just park on one while you're doing something else and wait for activity.

Time/frequency standard stations are on 5.0, 10.0 and 15.0 MHz AM, so either LSB or USB will do. CHU Ottawa is on 7335 and 14 670 kHz USB.

72,  
J. Bruce Prior N7RR  
Kairos Research  
853 Alder Street  
Blaine, WA 98230-8030  
360-332-6046

Patronize tobacco-free enterprises and institutions.

-----  
Tired of slow downloads and busy signals? Get a high-speed Internet connection! Comparison-shop your local high-speed providers here.  
<https://broadband.msn.com>

-----  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 23:47:06 -0700  
From: "Floyd Smithberg" <nq7x@earthlink.net>  
To: <jwsteven@concentric.net>  
Cc: "QRP-L Message" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162303] Re: [azqrp] AZ ScQRPion List  
Message-ID: <002001c3ba32\$6f6a3b70\$8a1056d1@FloydNQ7X>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Sorry I've been a bit slow answering your email. I run from before  
daylight  
> to late evening. You seem to be on the azqrp list just fine as we see  
your  
> posts. Don't know why you don't seem to be receiving the mail from the  
> list... I'll post a test message to see if you get it  
FSXXXX> Well I got yhis msg ok if it was sent to the list not my regular  
address.

I can post to the list but haven't been receiving any from it  
>  
> I just plain forgot about your machine having trouble. I really do  
> apologize. Memory is getting worse and worse. Were you able to make any  
> headway on getting it fixed? Please let me know.  
> FSXXXX> Well, I have Flight Simulator working finally and seem to have  
gotten rid of  
the VeriSign problem.....still get all the extra icons from my desktop  
when shutting down  
but that isn't a big bother.....

> Hope to see you at the hamfest on Saturday. We had planned to meet at  
10am  
> at the entrance to the swap area, then move over to Mike's table so he and  
> Gale can attend a quick meeting without having to leave the table. Paddle  
> status is on the list and maybe see if anyone has any ideas about how to  
> rejuvenate the FYB0.  
FSXXXX> I won't be at the ham fest but Mike will fill me in on the meeting  
we LL

frequently.  
> Yep, you heard right. We could use some volunteers for the paddles.  
Mainly  
> in the kitting and hole tapping areas right now. Gale, Jerry, and I  
> finished up the first 100 tonight at Jerry's place in Peoria. He'll mail  
> this batch Thursday. We'll cut metal stock on Saturday after the hamfest  
to  
> start the next run of 200. Yep, 200 more. This next 200 is nearly 2/3  
sold  
> out. We haven't even hit the other lists like Elecraft, HFPACK, FT817,  
and  
> FISTS. First run went in about four hours.  
> FSXXXX> I've noticed all the posts on QRPL....sounds great. Mike knows my  
setup here and can let me know how I can  
help.....tapping ok.

73 Floyd NQ7X Phoenix,AZ DM33VQ

> 73 john k5js  
>  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 05:57:05 -0500 (EST)  
From: Thom LaCosta <baltimoremd@baltimoremd.com>  
To: "W. Keith Hibbert" <wkhibbert@frontiernet.net>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162304] Re: Cable Modem Interference  
Message-ID: <20031204055502.J30481-1000000@unix1.vhost.min.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Wed, 3 Dec 2003, W. Keith Hibbert wrote:

>  
> Now, why did they pick 10-Meters to run Road Runner???

Calculated guess that:  
A. There would be little activity  
B. Activity would not be constant(you fooled them)  
C. Active users would be operating equipment that  
wasn't "dirty".

Thom

|   |  |
|---|--|
| baltimoremd@baltimoremd.com   | Thom LaCosta K3HRN Webmaster           |
| <a href="http://www.baltimoremd.com/">http://www.baltimoremd.com/</a>   | Baltimore's Home Page                  |
| <a href="http://www.baltimorehon.com/">http://www.baltimorehon.com/</a> | Home of the Baltimore Lexicon          |
| <a href="http://www.zerobeat.net">http://www.zerobeat.net</a>           | Home of The QRP Web Ring and DrakeList |
| <a href="http://www.tlchost.net">http://www.tlchost.net</a>             | Web Hosting as low as \$3.49/month     |

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 05:31:28 -0600  
From: "Meier, Peter H." <peter.meier@unisys.com>  
To: "'qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU'" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162305] Looking for a KD1JV "0-10 Watt RMS RF Power Meter Kit"  
Message-ID: <B537C25F1545D7118DBD00104B937E61C65F73@US-EA-EXCH-12>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Looking to purchase or trade for built or unbuilt KD1JV "0-10 Watt RMS RF Power Meter Kit". It has not been available for some time now.

Just thought someone out there may be willing to part with one.

Please respond off the list to pmeier@mac.com

Pete WK8S

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 11:48:33 +0000  
From: wd8civ@att.net  
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu (Qrp-1 Qrp-1)  
Subject: [162306] Re: Cable Modem Interference  
Message-ID: <120420031148.25159.1ecd@att.net>

> I have to say, the level of training evident from this conversation was  
> refreshing. Also, the tech's familiarity with the regs and recognizing  
> ingress to be their problem, not mine, was a bit of a surprise.  
>  
> Now, why did they pick 10-Meters to run Road Runner???

Keith,

Because 11 meters is worse? (Grin)

My guess is because it fits in the bandwidth of their system but is outside of the frequencies that are used for television signals. This is only a guess, though.

Dave

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 06:48:14 -0500  
From: "John Huffman" <hjohnc@core.com>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162307] December Spartan Sprint Results  
Message-ID: <003801c3ba5c\$85e1c830\$8e9159cf@jhuffman1t>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

### Results of the December 2003 Spartan Sprint

It was a good night for 40 meters! Conditions varied across the country, but most places enjoyed good conditions on 40. However, 20 meters only lasted the first hour, if at all. Ten and fifteen were non-existent. Eighty meters is coming on strong as winter approaches.

The total number of logs was 87. That's one of the highest totals we've had in a while.

Here's the band statistics:

| Band    | This Month | Last Month |
|---------|------------|------------|
| 80M -   | 383        | 162 QSOs   |
| 40M -   | 1402       | 1189 QSOs  |
| 20M -   | 198        | 349 QSOs   |
| 15M -   | 0          | 2 QSOs     |
| 10M -   | 0          | 0 QSOs     |
| Total - | 1983       | 1702 QSOs  |

### Skinny Winners -

Doc K0EVZ may have changed QTH's, but continues his winning ways. His 72 contacts and a weight just over half a pound were a successful combination.

Bob N4BP managed to take second in both Skinny and Tubby categories. High QSO number, 95, and modest weight, 1.13 pounds, were winners. Check out the [www.ARSqrp.com](http://www.ARSqrp.com) web page on the link to "Weight Rules" and there's a photo of Bob's rig on the scales at the bottom of the page.

Phil K4PQC was third with 25 forty meter QSOs and only a third of a pound for weight.

### Tubby Division Winners -

Jim WA9TZE won the overall this month by spreading out over three bands.

His high total was 95 QSOs. Bob N4BP was second in this category also with 95 QSOs, just behind Jim. Todd N9NE took third with a strong effort mostly on 40 and 80.

Special Recognition, Outside Operation -

NE5DL

K2 with internal battery. 88ft doublet at 28ft on Poles. 40ft of 300 ohm feedline into Elecraft Balun. Operated outside on the back patio here in Mansfield TX, temp about 55 degs. FB contest and had 1st qso ever with my Elmer K20H in NY.

AE7RW

Myself and Worth, W7WG, parked my VW van in a large damp field near Olympia and set up in the dark. We used an Inv V doublet @ 23 ft in center @ 10 ft on each end with twin lead thru a window in the van. Power out was 2 watts from Yaesu 817 & Z-11 and a 3 a/h gel cel. Used a straight key most of the time. TU to Al, K7PUC, for the use of his field.

WA8REI (well, portable)

Op'd from dinette of motor home in driveway. WX: 22 F, clear, strong WNW wind gusting to 30 mph!

N8HSP (also portable, for a while)

Well I started out in the car using a mag mount, tried both 20 es 40 mtr. Waste of time, cudn't hear a thing. Ran upstairs to the attic and tried to string up some speaker cable that I normally use with my DK9SQ mast. (dang near as cold up there as it is outside ;-)) And remember, If it's portable and outdoors, it's Adventure Radio! Well I got 50% of the above. ;-)

Late Logs -

In November KG4GVL had three contacts and three pounds; K4BAI had 30 contacts and 30 pounds; W7WG had nine contacts with a borrowed Orion at 2 watts; and N0EA had 23 QSOs.

## RESULTS -

Each contact received one point. If you didn't tell us the weight of your station, or if your station weighed more than my car, we assigned a weight of 30 pounds.

The soapbox is published separately in the December issue of The ARS Sojourner which comes out soon. Don't miss it! [www.ARSqrp.com](http://www.ARSqrp.com)

We hope everyone had a good time. See you in January!

### THE SKINNY DIVISION (results sorted in the order of points per pound)

| Call      | 80M | 40M | 20M | 15M | 10M | Points | Weight | Points |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|--------|
| Per Pound |     |     |     |     |     |        |        |        |
| K0EVZ     | 0   | 67  | 5   | 0   | 0   | 72     | 0.56   | 128.57 |
| N4BP      | 0   | 94  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 95     | 1.13   | 84.07  |
| K4PQC     | 0   | 25  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 25     | 0.33   | 75.76  |
| K3ESE     | 0   | 34  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 36     | 0.88   | 40.91  |
| AC3A      | 0   | 10  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 10     | 0.32   | 31.25  |
| N3AO      | 0   | 22  | 3   | 0   | 0   | 25     | 0.9    | 27.78  |
| KB9ZUR    | 0   | 33  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 33     | 1.2    | 27.5   |
| W6ZH      | 0   | 26  | 19  | 0   | 0   | 45     | 2.45   | 18.37  |
| KF0N      | 0   | 43  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 43     | 3      | 14.33  |
| N0TK      | 0   | 25  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 25     | 2      | 12.5   |
| K5LN      | 0   | 47  | 9   | 0   | 0   | 56     | 5      | 11.2   |
| K4GT      | 0   | 18  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 18     | 2      | 9      |
| N4HAY     | 12  | 24  | 6   | 0   | 0   | 42     | 5      | 8.4    |
| WB8RTJ    | 0   | 21  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 23     | 2.8    | 8.21   |
| AE6N      | 0   | 16  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 18     | 2.31   | 7.79   |
| W1PID     | 0   | 9   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 9      | 1.2    | 7.5    |
| KI0II     | 7   | 14  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 23     | 3.5    | 6.57   |
| WA1ZCB    | 0   | 13  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 13     | 2.06   | 6.31   |
| N7RVD     | 3   | 18  | 10  | 0   | 0   | 31     | 5      | 6.2    |
| KA9UDA    | 6   | 5   | 5   | 0   | 0   | 16     | 2.6    | 6.15   |
| NN4CW     | 0   | 5   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 5      | 1      | 5      |
| N6IZ      | 3   | 26  | 6   | 0   | 0   | 35     | 7      | 5      |
| WA8REI    | 9   | 17  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 27     | 5.5    | 4.91   |
| K6III     | 0   | 40  | 27  | 0   | 0   | 67     | 14.12  | 4.75   |
| KB7Q      | 0   | 13  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 13     | 3      | 4.33   |
| NE5DL     | 1   | 22  | 5   | 0   | 0   | 28     | 6.5    | 4.31   |
| W2BVH     | 30  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 30     | 7      | 4.29   |
| KG4LDY    | 0   | 8   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 8      | 1.9    | 4.21   |

|        |    |    |    |   |   |    |       |      |
|--------|----|----|----|---|---|----|-------|------|
| KK3B   | 0  | 12 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3.1   | 4.19 |
| K9YT   | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 4  | 0.979 | 4.09 |
| AF4LQ  | 38 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 38 | 10    | 3.8  |
| W6AZ   | 8  | 11 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 25 | 6.58  | 3.8  |
| KB9LCK | 3  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 8  | 2.4   | 3.33 |
| WA9TZE | 23 | 53 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 30    | 3.23 |
| KA3WMJ | 9  | 13 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 22 | 7     | 3.14 |
| KG7GA  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 6  | 2.04  | 2.94 |
| WB8ICN | 0  | 10 | 3  | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4.5   | 2.89 |
| N9NE   | 24 | 51 | 6  | 0 | 0 | 81 | 30    | 2.7  |
| K5MVR* | 0  | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4.1   | 2.68 |
| AF4PP  | 4  | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4     | 2.5  |
| W3ANX  | 14 | 7  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 25 | 10    | 2.5  |
| K3TW   | 17 | 56 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 74 | 30    | 2.47 |
| KE0G   | 27 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 27 | 11    | 2.45 |
| N0AR   | 4  | 8  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5     | 2.4  |
| W0UFO  | 0  | 35 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 35 | 15    | 2.33 |
| K7RE   | 4  | 61 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 65 | 30    | 2.17 |
| K6LG   | 6  | 17 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 31 | 15    | 2.07 |
| W0PWE  | 10 | 51 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 61 | 30    | 2.03 |
| VE3WMB | 0  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5  | 2.5   | 2    |
| N0IBT  | 0  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  | 4.5   | 2    |
| AE7RW  | 0  | 11 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6.6   | 1.82 |
| WA4CIT | 0  | 14 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8.82  | 1.81 |
| VE3XT  | 0  | 17 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 18 | 10    | 1.8  |
| AL7FS  | 0  | 0  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8     | 1.62 |
| KD5UDB | 0  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7.6   | 1.58 |
| NA8M   | 15 | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 13    | 1.46 |
| N4DMI  | 0  | 5  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 6  | 4.2   | 1.43 |
| K7TQ   | 0  | 42 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 42 | 30    | 1.4  |
| NK6A   | 0  | 7  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7.6   | 1.32 |
| N0YGY  | 4  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  | 7     | 1.29 |
| N5IB   | 0  | 27 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 28 | 30    | 0.93 |
| KB2FEL | 15 | 11 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 26 | 30    | 0.87 |
| K5JHP  | 0  | 25 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30    | 0.83 |
| WN1B   | 18 | 1  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 21 | 30    | 0.7  |
| K8KFJ  | 17 | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 21 | 30    | 0.7  |
| AA0VE  | 0  | 8  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 8  | 12.3  | 0.65 |
| NK0E   | 0  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 | 20    | 0.6  |
| KD3FG  | 13 | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 17 | 30    | 0.57 |
| KA8LLE | 13 | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 16 | 28    | 0.57 |
| AC7XR  | 0  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  | 16    | 0.56 |
| W4NJK  | 5  | 6  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 14 | 30    | 0.47 |
| W8YMO  | 7  | 7  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 14 | 30    | 0.47 |
| N8XD   | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4  | 9.5   | 0.42 |
| KG6WP  | 0  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5  | 12    | 0.42 |
| WB6BWZ | 0  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 | 30    | 0.4  |
| KL7RHJ | 0  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 5  | 16    | 0.31 |



|        |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |      |
|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|
| W8VE   | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 30  | 0.3  |
| K4JPN  | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 30  | 0.27 |
| AD6FR  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25  | 0.24 |
| AJ1J   | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9.6 | 0.21 |
| K3AS   | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 30  | 0.2  |
| AA8IV  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12  | 0.17 |
| K04PY  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30  | 0.17 |
| WA1VGB | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 30  | 0.13 |
| N3FZX  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 30  | 0.07 |
| N8HSP  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16  | 0.06 |
| N1AOK  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30  | 0.03 |

THE TUBBY DIVISION (results sorted in the order of points)

| Call   | 80M | 40M | 20M | 15M | 10M | Points |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| WA9TZE | 23  | 53  | 21  | 0   | 0   | 97     |
| N4BP   | 0   | 94  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 95     |
| N9NE   | 24  | 51  | 6   | 0   | 0   | 81     |
| K3TW   | 17  | 56  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 74     |
| K0EVZ  | 0   | 67  | 5   | 0   | 0   | 72     |
| K6III  | 0   | 40  | 27  | 0   | 0   | 67     |
| K7RE   | 4   | 61  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 65     |
| W0PWE  | 10  | 51  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 61     |
| K5LN   | 0   | 47  | 9   | 0   | 0   | 56     |
| W6ZH   | 0   | 26  | 19  | 0   | 0   | 45     |
| KF0N   | 0   | 43  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 43     |
| K7TQ   | 0   | 42  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 42     |
| N4HAY  | 12  | 24  | 6   | 0   | 0   | 42     |
| AF4LQ  | 38  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 38     |
| K3ESE  | 0   | 34  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 36     |
| N6IZ   | 3   | 26  | 6   | 0   | 0   | 35     |
| W0UFO  | 0   | 35  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 35     |
| KB9ZUR | 0   | 33  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 33     |
| N7RVD  | 3   | 18  | 10  | 0   | 0   | 31     |
| K6LG   | 6   | 17  | 8   | 0   | 0   | 31     |
| W2BVH  | 30  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 30     |
| NE5DL  | 1   | 22  | 5   | 0   | 0   | 28     |
| N5IB   | 0   | 27  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 28     |
| WA8REI | 9   | 17  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 27     |
| KE0G   | 27  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 27     |
| KB2FEL | 15  | 11  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 26     |
| K5JHP  | 0   | 25  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 25     |
| N3AO   | 0   | 22  | 3   | 0   | 0   | 25     |
| N0TK   | 0   | 25  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 25     |
| W3ANX  | 14  | 7   | 4   | 0   | 0   | 25     |
| K4PQC  | 0   | 25  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 25     |
| W6AZ   | 8   | 11  | 6   | 0   | 0   | 25     |
| WB8RTJ | 0   | 21  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 23     |
| KI0II  | 7   | 14  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 23     |

|        |    |    |    |   |   |    |
|--------|----|----|----|---|---|----|
| KA3WMJ | 9  | 13 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| WN1B   | 18 | 1  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| K8KFJ  | 17 | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| NA8M   | 15 | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| K4GT   | 0  | 18 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| AE6N   | 0  | 16 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| VE3XT  | 0  | 17 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| KD3FG  | 13 | 4  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| WA4CIT | 0  | 14 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| KA9UDA | 6  | 5  | 5  | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| KA8LLE | 13 | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| W4NJK  | 5  | 6  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| W8YMO  | 7  | 7  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| WB8ICN | 0  | 10 | 3  | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| KB7Q   | 0  | 13 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| KK3B   | 0  | 12 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| AL7FS  | 0  | 0  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| WA1ZCB | 0  | 13 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| KD5UDB | 0  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| WB6BWZ | 0  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| AE7RW  | 0  | 11 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| NK0E   | 0  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| N0AR   | 4  | 8  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| K5MVR* | 0  | 8  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| AC3A   | 0  | 10 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| AF4PP  | 4  | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| NK6A   | 0  | 7  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| W1PID  | 0  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  |
| N0IBT  | 0  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  |
| N0YGY  | 4  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  |
| AC7XR  | 0  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  |
| W8VE   | 0  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9  |
| AA0VE  | 0  | 8  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 8  |
| KB9LCK | 3  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 8  |
| K4JPN  | 0  | 8  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 8  |
| KG4LDY | 0  | 8  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 8  |
| KG7GA  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 6  |
| K3AS   | 0  | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 6  |
| AD6FR  | 3  | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 6  |
| N4DMI  | 0  | 5  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 6  |
| VE3WMB | 0  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5  |
| KL7RHJ | 0  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 5  |
| NN4CW  | 0  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5  |
| K04PY  | 0  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5  |
| KG6WP  | 0  | 5  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5  |
| N8XD   | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4  |
| WA1VGB | 3  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4  |
| K9YT   | 0  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 4  |

|       |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| N3FZX | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| AA8IV | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| AJ1J  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| N1AOK | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| N8HSP | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

-----

Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 07:39:00 -0500  
 From: Kenneth Cooperstein <cprstn54@att.net>  
 To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU  
 Subject: [162308] Why have mono phone plugs and cables?  
 Message-ID: <3FCF2AE4.8090600@att.net>  
 MIME-version: 1.0  
 Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
 Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I am about to order 3.5mm patch cords. I am trying to decide whether I need mono plugs (for mono jacks) or can I use stereo patch cords for everything?

Is there any reason that a stereo phone jack and cable won't work in a mono jack? Are mono jack ground contact positions non-standard? It wouldn't be OK if one mono jack ground was tapping ring3 and the other end was tapping ring2.

Ken KC2JDY

-----

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 07:13:29 -0600  
 From: "Donald Dorn" <DDORN@CWIS.NET>  
 To: "Low Power Amateur Radio" <QRP-L@LEHIGH.EDU>  
 Subject: [162309] FS: KK7B MINI R2 RECEIVERS  
 Message-ID: <000501c3ba68\$6a561f60\$1c182641@computer>  
 MIME-Version: 1.0  
 Content-Type: text/plain;  
     charset="iso-8859-1"  
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I am selling two of these little receivers. Have use both on several bands and they work very well. Both have 1K filters installed rather than the wider filters which come with the kits.

Receiver boards and documentation only, no vfo or phase shift circuit.

25 bucks each, postpaid US.

73,  
Don K5AAR

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 08:13:53 -0500 (EST)  
From: "n2cx" <n2cx@voicenet.com>  
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu  
Cc: rohre@arlut.utexas.edu  
Subject: [162310] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
Message-ID: <200312041313.hB4DDrdB017494@email2.voicenet.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Stuart,

The receiver you mention was from an article in QST back in the 60's so that jibes with your remembered time frame. Alas I tried a QST title search on the ARRL Member's Only site and came up empty.

It did indeed use a two-transistor astable multiivibrator as the LO and another transistor as the mixer. Here on the east coast I could hear all kinds of stuff - not surprising since the US gummint stations ran enough power to be heard by submerged subs on the other side of the globe.

There are a lot fewer VLF stations these days....

I noted an interesting phenomenon in mine. I had only a wirewound pot to use for frequency control so when I adjusted it the tuning freq jumped in steps as the wiper went from turr to turn. It sounded like todays synthesized rigs when you tune them.

Perhaps you can find a full yearly QSR index for the 60's and do a manual search.

72/73,

Joe E., N2CX

-----

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 08:19:46 -0500 (EST)  
From: "n2cx" <n2cx@voicenet.com>  
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu  
Cc: rohre@arlut.utexas.edu  
Subject: [162311] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
Message-ID: <200312041319.hB4DJktS021238@email2.voicenet.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Stuart,

I found the reference!

Oct 1962, QST, p. 36 NAA Receiver, An, Pearson, E.E., W3QY

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 07:08:36 -0700  
From: Jerry Haigwood <w5jh@swlink.net>  
To: QRP-L Reflector <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162312] AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <3FCF3FE4.6C9A5815@swlink.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Folks,

The latest S/N list has been posted to the web. To check for your name, go to:

<<http://www.swlink.net/~w5jh/brasspaddle.htm>> and then click on "serial numbers list." On Saturday we will start cutting brass for batch 2 and hope to be shipping it around December 20.

Jerry W5JH

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 14:09:35 -0000  
From: "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162313] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <FDE0KGEJJFNPABJIJGDDAEHNHAAA.radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>  
> At any rate, I highly recommend learning and getting reasonably good with  
> assembly before jumping to C or BASIC compilers. You really need to  
> understand the little critters' internal workings and instruction set if  
> you're going to do non-trivial things with them, and do them reasonably  
> well.  
>

I could not disagree more about the use of C compilers.

As somebody who has professionally built embedded systems for the past 20 years, I can assure you that there is absolutely no need to know any of the assembly language instructions for the PIC or any other microprocessor in order to make best use of it. You do, however, have to understand the architecture of the beast and the routines provided by the C compiler supplier to attack the various goodies the chip contains, but that is about it.

I personally use the CCS compiler for both professional and ham radio related PIC projects and I have yet to find a reason to code anything in assembly language. If the C code seems slow, choose a faster processor or look at optimising your code to make it more efficient. That also goes for the size of the code, if you cannot get it into the chip, look at a chip with more memory or again look at your code design and optimise it.

With the CCS compiler you get a combined listing of the C source and the assembler output. If you are having problems with either speed or size, try doing the operation a number of different ways in C and look at the combined listing to see how much code is created for each statement. Don't worry about the code itself, you are only interested in the number of bytes created by the compiler. Often by slightly re-arranging the code you can significantly increase or decrease the number of bytes of assembly code created.

C code is many times more readable than assembly language and therefore much easier to both write and debug. Good tight coding is entirely possible with C, design in it and let the compiler take care of generating the assembly language code! Should you ever decide to port the code to another family of microprocessors, you simply need to find a compiler for the chip rather than having to completely recode the software in a different assembly language.

Just my tuppence worth.

Ray, G4FON

Incidentally, if you are looking for shareware PIC tools, look at  
<[www.picant.com](http://www.picant.com)>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 14:17:47 +0000  
From: wd8civ@att.net  
To: cprstn54@att.net  
Cc: qrp-1@lehigh.edu (Qrp-1 Qrp-1)  
Subject: [162314] Re: Why have mono phone plugs and cables?  
Message-ID: <120420031417.28206.6f1a@att.net>

Ken,

The ring conductor on a stereo plug will usually contact the ground conductor of a mono jack. Depending on your application, that might not be a problem. I have discovered that it can allow you to use a stereo headphone with a mono output device - by leaving the headphone ground open, it essentially places the two speakers in series.

If you're only connecting mono devices to other mono devices with your patch cords it might work, but the ring will be used as the ground. If they're supposed to be shielded cords, the shields won't connect to anything.

Dave

> I am about to order 3.5mm patch cords. I am trying to decide whether I  
> need mono plugs (for mono jacks) or can I use stereo patch cords for  
> everything?  
>  
> Is there any reason that a stereo phone jack and cable won't work in a  
> mono jack? Are mono jack ground contact positions non-standard? It  
> wouldn't be OK if one mono jack ground was tapping ring3 and the other  
> end was tapping ring2.  
>  
> Ken KC2JDY  
>  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 08:20:32 -0600  
From: "Joe Martin" <km5cw@wt.net>  
To: "QRP" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162315] The TOP 100 list is posted  
Message-ID: <002401c3ba71\$c7cf0590\$de4cd6d0@JoesHome1>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ok it has been posted, go see if you made the cut.

[http://www.swlink.net/~w5jh/serial\\_numbers.htm](http://www.swlink.net/~w5jh/serial_numbers.htm)

Folks thanks for making such a popular toy for us old hams.

73 de KM5CW, Joe

ARCI #11368 FP#-697 FISTS#4217

GRID EM13kf FtWorth,Tx

32:49:31N 97:06:13W

(<http://web.wt.net/~km5cw>)

-----| Virus Scanned by Symantec |-----

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 09:29:57 -0500  
From: "carl seyersdahl" <carlseye@tampabay.rr.com>  
To: <wd8civ@att.net>,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162316] Re: Cable Modem Interference  
Message-ID: <008101c3ba73\$21083fe0\$7a3cca44@tampabay.rr.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It's a good thing you don't have a KW on that freq!!!!!!

----- Original Message -----

From: <wd8civ@att.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 6:48 AM  
Subject: Re: Cable Modem Interference

>  
> > I have to say, the level of training evident from this conversation was  
> > refreshing. Also, the tech's familiarity with the regs and recognizing  
> > ingress to be their problem, not mine, was a bit of a surprise.  
> >  
> > Now, why did they pick 10-Meters to run Road Runner???  
>  
> Keith,  
>  
> Because 11 meters is worse? (Grin)



>  
> My guess is because it fits in the bandwidth of their system but is  
> outside of the frequencies that are used for television signals. This is  
only  
> a guess, though.  
>  
> Dave

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 06:32:57 -0600  
From: "Pat Armstrong" <aa7fg@gte.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162317] MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
Message-ID: <001d01c3ba62\$c1408be0\$2f7ee143@vectrav1400mt>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
                charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello to all,

I just acquired an Super Antenna MP-1 portable vertical and found that the nylon band lock screw that secures the sliding collar to the coil is stripped... I am attempting to contact the vendor, but was wondering if someone here has an extra piece or perhaps a better solution to use... Also, has anyone tried the mobile kit accessory to improve efficiency and if so how did it work out... Sure appreciate the help and many thanks...

Pat, AA7FG - Oregon

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 08:31:41 -0600  
From: "Michael Melland, W9WIS" <w9wis@charter.net>  
To: rohre@arlut.utexas.edu,  
        Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162318] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
Message-ID: <000601c3ba73\$5762e450\$4986e98d@winad.it.uwosh.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Although I'm sure they utilize other modes/codes the coded messages to subs under water take a long time to be transmitted and received at 76 Hz. IIRC

I was told up to 3 minutes per character. But I suspect advancements in the system may have cut that time down substantially.

Mike, W9WIS

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 08:35:44 -0600  
From: "Donald Dorn" <DDORN@CWIS.NET>  
To: <DDORN@CWIS.NET>,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162319] Re: KK7B MINI R2 RECEIVERS  
Message-ID: <002701c3ba73\$e7c41aa0\$3a182641@computer>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sorry folks. Both receivers are spoken for.  
73,  
Don K5AAR

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 09:05:27 -0600  
From: Chuck Carpenter <w5usj@9plus.net>  
To: aa7fg@gte.net,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162320] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
Message-ID: <3.0.2.32.20031204090527.00841870@mail.9plus.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Pat,

I ordered some 1/4-20 thumb screws from Mouser for that purpose. They are nylon so still subject to stripping if torqued too much.

Mouser P/N -- 561-T2520050 Eagle Plastics

If some could be found made with delrin or other more durable plastics they would be better. I'm looking into sources.

I have the longer mobile base and whip section and it works a whole lot better at least for 20 meters and up. Probably helps for 40 too but I haven't tried it.

At 06:32 AM 12/04/2003 -0600, Pat Armstrong wrote:

>Hello to all,

>

>I just acquired an Super Antenna MP-1 portable vertical and found that the  
>nylon band lock screw that secures the sliding collar to the coil is  
>stripped... I am attempting to contact the vendor, but was wondering if  
>someone here has an extra piece or perhaps a better solution to use... Also,  
>has anyone tried the mobile kit accessory to improve efficiency and if so  
>how did it work out... Sure appreciate the help and many thanks...

>

>Pat, AA7FG - Oregon

>

>

Chuck Carpenter, W5USJ, Point, Rains Co., TX - EM22cv, NETXQRP #1  
QRP-ARCI #5422, QRP-L #1306, QRPp-I #115, ARS #1280, SOC #57  
Zombie #759, COG #11, 6 Club #201, FP #601 oo <http://www.netxqrp.org>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 10:28:41 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)

From: "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>

To: <aa7fg@gte.net>, <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [162321] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>

Message-ID: <3FCF52A9.000047.03692@compaq1500>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: Text/Plain

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=0D

A good hardware store should have nylon screws, you could use aluminum o=  
r  
stainless steel or plain steel as well, steel will of course rust. The  
mobile accessory kit is quite worth it, you really don't want to drive wi=  
th  
the collapsible whip. I did use the stock model a few days ago while park=  
ed  
to talk to a fellow in KY from here near Cleveland on 40 M using a KX1, i=  
t  
worked fine. =0D

=0D

73/72 - Mike WA8BXN

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 10:27:11 -0500

From: Lee Mairs <lmairs@direcway.com>

To: w5jh@swlink.net,  
Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162322] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <058c01c3ba7b\$1be1c330\$3b6d020a@J4>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Geez! My number still isn't posted, and I've been practicing polishing and sanding brass all week...

Jerry, you guys are doing a great job with this kit. It's popularity is an indicator of the debt that the rest of us owe you for making this opportunity available to. You sure have my thanks!  
73 de Lee  
KM4YY/8

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Jerry Haigwood" <w5jh@swlink.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 9:08 AM  
Subject: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List

> Folks,  
> The latest S/N list has been posted to the web. To check for your  
> name, go to:  
> <<http://www.swlink.net/~w5jh/brasspaddle.htm>> and then click on "serial  
> numbers list." On Saturday we will start cutting brass for batch 2 and  
> hope to be shipping it around December 20.  
>  
> Jerry W5JH  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 10:34:01 -0500  
From: Lee Mairs <lmairs@direcway.com>  
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162323] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <059201c3ba7c\$0fa0bfd0\$3b6d020a@J4>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Boy, do I disagree with Ray on this one. I developed and managed a group of microprocessor software developers since the early days of the 8080. The folks that had an early grounding in assembly language always seemed to write tighter high level code with fewer bugs. Plus, they knew the benefit of proper and complete in-line comments/documentation.

It is sort of like the benefits of an engineering education (aka life in a calculus monastery). You might not learn much that is directly transferable over the rest of your life, but it sure taught you how to think and approach problems.

73 de Lee  
KM4YY/8

----- Original Message -----

From: "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 9:09 AM  
Subject: RE: [Elmer160] C compilers

> >  
> > At any rate, I highly recommend learning and getting reasonably good with  
> > assembly before jumping to C or BASIC compilers. You really need to  
> > understand the little critters' internal workings and instruction set if  
> > you're going to do non-trivial things with them, and do them reasonably  
> > well.  
> >  
>  
> I could not disagree more about the use of C compilers.  
>  
> As somebody who has professionally built embedded systems for the past 20 years,  
> I can assure you that there is absolutely no need to know any of the assembly  
> language instructions for the PIC or any other microprocessor in order to make  
> best use of it. You do, however, have to understand the architecture of the  
> beast and the routines provided by the C compiler supplier to attack the various  
> goodies the chip contains, but that is about it.  
>  
> I personally use the CCS compiler for both professional and ham radio related  
> PIC projects and I have yet to find a reason to code anything in assembly

> language. If the C code seems slow, choose a faster processor or look at  
> optimising your code to make it more efficient. That also goes for the  
size of  
> the code, if you cannot get it into the chip, look at a chip with more  
memory or  
> again look at your code design and optimise it.  
>  
> With the CCS compiler you get a combined listing of the C source and the  
> assembler output. If you are having problems with either speed or size,  
try  
> doing the operation a number of different ways in C and look at the  
combined  
> listing to see how much code is created for each statement. Don't worry  
about  
> the code itself, you are only interested in the number of bytes created by  
the  
> compiler. Often by slightly re-arranging the code you can significantly  
increase  
> or decrease the number of bytes of assembly code created.  
>  
> C code is many times more readable than assembly language and therefore  
much  
> easier to both write and debug. Good tight coding is entirely possible  
with C,  
> design in it and let the compiler take care of generating the assembly  
language  
> code! Should you ever decide to port the code to another family of  
> microprocessors, you simply need to find a compiler for the chip rather  
than  
> having to completely recode the software in a different assembly language.  
>  
> Just my tuppence worth.  
>  
> Ray, G4FON  
>  
> Incidentally, if you are looking for shareware PIC tools, look at  
> <[www.picant.com](http://www.picant.com)>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

-----

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 09:37:58 -0600  
From: "Jerry Ford" <[benlightnd13@mchsi.com](mailto:benlightnd13@mchsi.com)>

To: "Elecraft@mailman.qth.net" <elecraft@mailman.qth.net>,  
"qrp-1" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>, "FPigs" <fpqrp-1@mpna.com>  
Subject: [162324] Re: [fpqrp] RUN FOR THE BACON  
Message-ID: <002a01c3ba7c\$98e8a3c0\$4a78da0c@mchsi.com>

Hi folks:

Jim bring up a good point here. For those of you just joining the club this year, the WAP stands for " Worked All Pigs for 2003 "

This is a contest in which we the membership compete to see who can work the most Flying Pig members in 2003.

It would be great if a great number of members were on the air for this event. WHY ?? Because that makes it much more fun for all involved and because it will give those who are interested in scoring well in this competition the opportunity to do so. ( realistically, the last opportunity as Jim says. )

So, please consider making time and being on the air for this sprint.

That said, we've been getting some awesome support from those of you who just like to work sprints and are not Flying Pig club members. I certainly don't want to discourage you from participating in this event. Your support adds much more to the enjoyment of putting this together and working it.

The Flying Pig QRP Club International is happy to sponsor this event and we hope each and every one of you will jump in and have some fun with us.

Again the date is DEC 15th starting at 0100z and running until 0300z  
<http://www.fpqrp.com/fpqrpun.html>

See you there:

72 Jerry NOJRN  
----- Original Message -----  
From: "Jim Sheldon" <w0eb@cox.net>

> There better be a bunch of Piggies there. This will be the last good chance  
> for some of us to pick up enough piggie numbers to really give LL and Jerry  
> a run for their money in the WAP contest!

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 11:10:37 EST  
From: Davewb4@aol.com  
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu  
Subject: [162325] RE: L-1682B1J Availability Last Bite  
Message-ID: <1a7.1d3270c0.2d00b67d@aol.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

All orders for the LCD have been filled. There were some stations who missed out on ordering, so I will place one last order for those who are still interested. To refresh, these LCD'S are the exact part called for on Trev's DDS. The cost is \$ 14.76 including shipping to your QTH via USPS Priority mail. Personal checks are OK and please include a shipping label. Please respond off the list, I will wait a few days before I place the order and will confirm each order.

73

Dave Rogers  
1760 SW 72 Ave.  
Plantation, FL 33317

WB4CHK

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 11:24:09 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)  
From: "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>  
To: <n0rc@yahoo.com>, <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162326] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
Message-ID: <3FCF5FA9.000049.03692@compaq1500>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: Text/Plain  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Isn't that the point, to get a good contact between the outer metal shell=  
1

and the coil at the point of resonance? The used part of the coil is below  
w

the shell/screw contact point, the top whip connects to the shell. Am I  
missing something here? =0D

=0D

73/72 - Mike WA8BXN =0D



=0D

-----=0D

=0D

Don't use a metal screw! The lock-screw contacts the coil windings, a=0D  
metal screw will create a dead-short to ground possibly damaging the=0D  
finals in your rig.=0D

=0D

73, Rod N0RC

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 09:48:26 -0700

From: "Rod N0RC" <rc7039-hr@yahoo.com>

To: "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>, <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [162327] Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>

Message-ID: <01c701c3ba86\$72746300\$6501a8c0@greyrock>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="Windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mike,

No! The locking screw secures the coil from moving, contact fingers in  
the outer coil housing provide the contacts to couple the radiator  
element.

73, Rod N0RC

\*\*Happy Holidays\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>

To: <n0rc@yahoo.com>; <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 9:24 AM

Subject: Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>

Isn't that the point, to get a good contact between the outer metal  
shell

and the coil at the point of resonance? The used part of the coil is  
below

the shell/screw contact point, the top whip connects to the shell. Am I  
missing something here?

73/72 - Mike WA8BXN

-----

Don't use a metal screw! The lock-screw contacts the coil windings, a metal screw will create a dead-short to ground possibly damaging the finals in your rig.

73, Rod N0RC

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 09:49:36 -0700  
From: "Rod N0RC" <rc7039-hr@yahoo.com>  
To: "qrp-1" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162328] Fw: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>  
Message-ID: <01d101c3ba86\$9b60c420\$6501a8c0@greyrock>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mike, et.al.,

Don't use a metal screw! The lock-screw contacts the coil windings, a metal screw will create a dead-short to ground possibly damaging the finals in your rig.

73, Rod N0RC  
\*\*Happy Holidays\*\*

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 8:28 AM  
Subject: Re: MP-1 band lock nylon screw...>

>  
> A good hardware store should have nylon screws, you could use  
> aluminum or  
> stainless steel or plain steel as well, steel will of course rust. The  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 08:59:46 -0800 (PST)  
From: Garie Halstead K8KFJ <khyberpass65@yahoo.com>

To: Nick Yokanovich <k3ny@cablespeed.com>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162329] Re: ET phone home!  
Message-ID: <20031204165946.8571.qmail@web60302.mail.yahoo.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

--- Nick Yokanovich <k3ny@cablespeed.com> wrote:

> NSS was the callsign of the Navy's Radio Transmitter Facility at  
> Annapolis, MD. The station was in operation from 1918 to 1996. I live  
>  
> nearby and was lucky to get a tour of the station in 1998, before it  
> was  
> completely demolished. (Most of the transmitter parts were sent to  
> Cutler and Jim Creek. There are great pictures on Jim Hawkins' web  
> site  
> at <http://hawkins.pair.com/nss.shtml> -- the size of the components is  
>  
> staggering! Plug "NSS Annapolis" into your browser for several very  
> informative sites about NSS.

Nick, I'm thinking NSS was the station I used to copy for the location  
of Icebergs in the North Atlantic that might be hazardous to shipping  
and military vessels. Am I correct?

72, Gary -K8KFJ-

-----  
Do you Yahoo!?  
Protect your identity with Yahoo! Mail AddressGuard  
<http://antispam.yahoo.com/whatsnewfree>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 10:20:37 -0700  
From: Jerry Haigwood <w5jh@swlink.net>  
To: Lee Mairs <lmairs@direcway.com>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162330] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <3FCF6CE5.36F1A138@swlink.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Lee Mairs wrote:

> Geez! My number still isn't posted, and I've been practicing polishing and

> sanding brass all week...  
>  
> Jerry, you guys are doing a great job with this kit. It's popularity is an  
> indicator of the debt that the rest of us owe you for making this  
> opportunity available to. You sure have my thanks!  
> 73 de Lee  
> KM4YY/8  
>

Lee,

You are in the middle of batch 2 - about S/N 155 or so.  
Jerry W5JH

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 11:23:43 -0600 (CST)  
From: Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>  
To: Ray Goff <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162331] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0312041103210.28276-100000@madmax.botkin.org>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Thu, 4 Dec 2003, Ray Goff wrote:

> > At any rate, I highly recommend learning and getting reasonably good with  
> > assembly before jumping to C or BASIC compilers. You really need to  
> > understand the little critters' internal workings and instruction set if  
> > you're going to do non-trivial things with them, and do them reasonably  
> > well.

> As somebody who has professionally built embedded systems for the past 20 years,  
> I can assure you that there is absolutely no need to know any of the assembly  
> language instructions for the PIC or any other microprocessor in order to make  
> best use of it. You do, however, have to understand the architecture of the  
> beast and the routines provided by the C compiler supplier to attack the various  
> goodies the chip contains, but that is about it.

I think we're in pretty complete disagreement on that point.

> I personally use the CCS compiler for both professional and ham radio related  
> PIC projects and I have yet to find a reason to code anything in assembly  
> language.

Then you're not pushing hard enough. 8-) There are times when the C code

to do something is simply unworkable. For example: Write code in C to swap the order of bits in a byte. Now try it with a little inline assembly. There are numerous other examples I have found. Granted, if you have some code or speed headroom, you're fine to let the compiler do its thing. But if you find yourself needing to wring every last cycle or (in my case) quite literally every last instruction location out of the thing, you MUST know your instruction set, AND the architecture, AND the compiler's weak and strong points. If not for some inline ASM code, my keyer would not have several features it has. In fact, much of the time I spend on maintaining and updating the code is devoted to code shrinks. All of what I find looks like perfectly fine C code (and is), but the ASM listing shows where there are gains to be made. If you can't tell what the ASM code is doing, you don't know if there are gains to be made or not.

- > If the C code seems slow, choose a faster processor or look at
- > optimising your code to make it more efficient. That also goes for the
- > size of the code, if you cannot get it into the chip, look at a chip
- > with more memory or again look at your code design and optimise it.

That works, IF you have the luxury of a faster or larger processor. In my own case, there is precisely one chip that meets my hardware requirements, so everything hinges on the ability to squeeze as much code as possible into that amount of program memory. And how can you optimize your code design if you don't know what the compiler is doing? If you're going to shrink code, you absolutely must be able to read the compiler's output listing and see where changes can be made.

- > With the CCS compiler you get a combined listing of the C source and the
- > assembler output. If you are having problems with either speed or size, try
- > doing the operation a number of different ways in C and look at the combined
- > listing to see how much code is created for each statement. Don't worry about
- > the code itself, you are only interested in the number of bytes created by the
- > compiler. Often by slightly re-arranging the code you can significantly increase
- > or decrease the number of bytes of assembly code created.

Agreed, but trial and error is a pretty inefficient way of doing things. It's far easier and faster if you understand *\*why\** things change.

Anyway, this is probably pretty OT for the QRP-L, so I'm willing to shut up on the subject and/or take it off-list if people are sick or hearing it.

73,  
Dale  
--

It's a thankless job, but I've got a lot of Karma to burn off.  
PicoKeyer Analog with pot speed control now available! Or add

memory and more to your Rock-Mite -- <http://www.hamgadgets.com>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 09:35:04 -0800  
From: Wayne Burdick <n6kr@elecraft.com>  
To: n7rr@hotmail.com  
Cc: qrp <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162332] Re: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
Message-ID: <3FCF7046.C6F6EFB9@elecraft.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Bruce,

Thanks for describing your experiences using the KX1 for short-wave listening.

I would like to correct one point. You said:

> ....(The USB mode employs the better filter shape for the highest band.)

This is actually not the reason USB is recommended on the 20 m band. The real reason is that the mixer injection level is somewhat reduced on this band in LSB mode. This is due to rolloff by the DDS low-pass filter, and has nothing to do with crystal filter passband shape. (This is mentioned in the manual, but could possibly be clarified.)

If there is any difference between USB and LSB in terms of crystal filter passband shape, it will be true for all three bands, not just the highest one. But I have not noticed such an effect myself when listening to AM or SSB stations.

73,  
Wayne  
N6KR

-----  
[www.elecraft.com](http://www.elecraft.com)  
-----

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 13:05:46 -0500 (Eastern Standard Time)  
From: "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>

```

=0D
The point of contact of the finger stock on the coil is about half an in=
ch
from the screw thread; at worst there would be several shorted turn insid=
e
the shell which would have minimal impact on operation, certainly would
cause no damage to the transmitter. There is no possibility of being=20
shorted to ground". Metal screws have many disadvantages (including nicki=
ng
the coil) and should not normally be used but could be until something
better is found. For fixed operation the screw is not really necessary. =0D
=0D

```

```
=0D  
=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=  
=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D =0D  
No! The locking screw secures the coil from moving, contact fingers in=0D  
the outer coil housing provide the contacts to couple the radiator=0D  
element.=0D  
=20
```

Hi Wayne,

Mark

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU] On Behalf  
Of Wayne Burdick

Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 12:35 PM

To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion

Subject: Re: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure

Hi Bruce,

Thanks for describing your experiences using the KX1 for short-wave  
listening.

I would like to correct one point. You said:

> ....(The USB mode employs the better filter shape for the highest  
band.)

This is actually not the reason USB is recommended on the 20 m band. The  
real  
reason is that the mixer injection level is somewhat reduced on this  
band in LSB  
mode. This is due to rolloff by the DDS low-pass filter, and has nothing  
to do  
with crystal filter passband shape. (This is mentioned in the manual,  
but could  
possibly be clarified.)

If there is any difference between USB and LSB in terms of crystal  
filter  
passband shape, it will be true for all three bands, not just the  
highest one.

But I have not noticed such an effect myself when listening to AM or SSB  
stations.

73,  
Wayne  
N6KR

-----  
  
[www.elecraft.com](http://www.elecraft.com)  
  
-----



Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 10:32:08 -0800  
From: Wayne Burdick <n6kr@elecraft.com>  
To: Mark Rauchfuss <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>  
Cc: "'Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion'" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162335] Re: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
Message-ID: <3FCF7DA4.4BE34D8F@elecraft.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mark Rauchfuss wrote:

> Why doesn't Elecraft create a version of the K2 with General Coverage  
> capability or perhaps an external GC or even a GC RX?

Hi Mark,

This is on our list.

Meanwhile, the KX1 makes a great pocket SWL receiver, and the K2 covers most of the popular SWL bands. It can even tune the high end of the AM broadcast band.

73,  
Wayne  
N6KR

--

<http://www.elecraft.com>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 11:14:27 -0600  
From: Mark Milburn <mark.milburn@ispwest.com>  
To: QRP-L Reflector <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162336] Iowa QRP Club CW Net  
Message-ID: <3FCF6B73.F962F9A7@ispwest.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Is it my neighbor's Christmas lights or band conditions? Fighting with S9+ noise, we had the following check-ins Wednesday night:

KQ0I Mark Iowa  
WA0ITP Terry Iowa  
WA8BXN Mike Ohio

NI0I Tom S.D  
N9MZP Walt IL

Thanks to those hearty souls!

72 Mark KQ0I  
Des Moines, Iowa

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 13:32:25 -0500  
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>  
To: "Michael Melland, W9WIS" <w9wis@charter.net>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162337] Re: "ET phone home" ?  
Message-ID: <3FCF7DB9.7E932394@erols.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mike,

That was probably after about 1975 when the navigation business was upset by the availability of GPS. Prior to that point in time the Naval Navigation Satellite System (NNSS) was used to transmit targeting information to Polaris Submarines.

The submarine had to come up to periscope depth to receive the data, but also got a very accurate (about 60 feet) at the same time. Though I was never associated with the submarine equipment, the AN/WRN-4, I believe, I was the Project Engineer for the surface ship equivalent, the AN/SRN-9. We used the same satellites so we received the same data. The data was encrypted and was ignored by my system.

The sub would have to remain at periscope depth until it had copied a full six minutes of data as I remember. The principle problems, aside from having to come up to periscope depth, were wave wash over the antenna (periscope mounted whip) and the availability of satellites!

I suspect that with the advent of GPS the satellites were only updated for a specific period of time. The satellites were updated about every 8 hours by a network of earth tracking stations located around the world. The systems at JHU/APL and Point Mugu, both close to where I have lived have since been scrapped. Boy I would like to have one of their old dishes, I would be a killer in EME contests!

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 13:52:26 -0500  
From: John Sielke <jsielke@pobox.com>  
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu  
Subject: [162338] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <3FCF826A.90507@pobox.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Whooppee! I made it! Serial Number 66!

John W2AGN

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 13:57:29 -0500  
From: John Sielke <jsielke@pobox.com>  
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu  
Subject: [162339] Unmitigated Self-Aggrandizement  
Message-ID: <3FCF8399.1000308@pobox.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have been trying for years to make the Top 10 in one of the ARCI QSO Parties. I have come close, but never made it.

UNTIL NOW! I just received a Certificate for the Fall Party and I made the Top 10! (Actually, #4).

I owe it all to:

1. Pacificon keeping a lot of testers off the air.
2. Lousy conditions.
3. My trusty K2!

(Actually, it's about 80% #1, but who's counting).

OK, bragging over.

Just couldn't help it....

John W2AGN

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 19:00:51 +0000  
From: Chuck Adams <k7qo@commspeed.net>  
To: dale@botkin.org,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162340] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <5.2.1.1.0.20031204183512.00b44d90@mail.commspeed.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

At 11:23 AM 12/4/2003 -0600, Dale Botkin wrote:

>...snip snip...  
>Anyway, this is probably pretty OT for the QRP-L, so I'm willing to shut  
>up on the subject and/or take it off-list if people are sick or hearing  
>it.  
>  
>73,  
>Dale

Dale et.al.,

Well written and I agree with the need for assembly language understanding and the architecture of a processor. It is not off topic for the discussion. Just as long as we don't get into flame wars on what is the best.

John M. picked the Microchip architecture to do and he has a hard row to hoe over the next year. But he stepped forward and is doing the job. You can't do any better than that.

Some will argue that newbies should go with Atmel or other uPs. If you think that, then step forward and do a course.

Time has passed long enough that a majority of this group (and the world) wasn't there in the 70's when we had to build systems like the Altair 8800, SWTP 6800 and 6809 systems, and others. There were no hard drives, much less floppy discs, etc. We used front panel switches to load loaders and then used things like Oliver Audio Engineering optical paper tape readers to

pull by hand the paper tape through to load a BASIC interpreter. I still have in the museum an autographed copy from Bill Gates. Systems ran at clock speeds of 1MHz (NOT GHz) We wrote monitors for 1K (that's not M) of ROM if we were lucky enough to have the latest EPROM memory. We used things like the Kansas City Standard to store programs onto audio cassette (audio tones to store the ASCII codes, one tone for 1 and one tone for 0). We should write some code to do the same thing using the new CD recorders.... :-) Any have the Kansas City standard notes? Harold Mauch (Percom Data systems. SK) and others be proud of us.

The Elmer160 thread will allow a new generation to experience what it was like back in the old days, except the development tools are now several orders of magnitude better. It seems like cheating to sit down at a 2.0GHz system with 1.0GB of ram and 120GB hard drives and do this stuff..... :-) Some of us went through a lot of trouble using an IBM 360/65 main frame to create a mag tape to take to a PDP-11/20 and punch a paper tape to read into the microprocessor system in a corner attached to a Tektronix raster display terminal that cost more than some people made in a year. :-) I wrote the cross-assembler in IBM 360 assembly language. That was what you'd call home brewing..... The cycle time on the extended memory for the main frame was 500 microseconds.

QRP rigs are beginning more and more to rely on uPs. You'll note that Elecraft and Small Wonder Labs both use Microchip processors. Steve Weber uses the Atmel processors, but he doesn't do large production runs that I have seen in his designs. Elmer160 allows many of us the opportunity to gets hands on experience in doing things like write code for a keyer, etc. I'm sure new applications will come from the project. Heck, maybe even some new kits for all of us to enjoy and play with.

FYI

Chuck Adams K7QO k7qo@commspeed.net  
<http://www.qsl.net/k7qo> CP-60

Moving to Arizona? Please bring your own water.

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 19:08:26 -0000  
From: "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
To: "Dale Botkin" <dale@botkin.org>  
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162341] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers

Message-ID: <FDEOKGEJJFNPABJIJGDDKEIDHAAA.radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Then you're not pushing hard enough. 8-) There are times when the C code  
> to do something is simply unworkable. For example: Write code in C to  
> swap the order of bits in a byte. Now try it with a little inline  
> assembly.

Dale,

You are right, it probably is time to take this off list, but I disagree that I'm not pushing hard enough.

Two examples which immediately spring to mind are an embedded 68000 system which manipulates video images using a real-time multi-tasking environment which I wrote from scratch in C - here the software is required to respond to a 20 millisecond video refresh rate whilst also handling user input via up to four RS232 ports. The only assembly code in the entire system (which fills 2 OneMegabyte EPROM's) is the task switcher which has to diddle with all the 68000 registers. The second example is an engine management system an dashboard display for a racing motorcycle, this time written entirely in C and running on a PIC16F876.

Even having completed those projects, if you were to ask me to write code in either 68000 or PIC assembly language, I have so little knowledge of the instruction sets that I could not do it for you. I am not necessarily proud of this, it is just that my brain does not need the additional clutter.

You can always find examples of situation where C (or any other high level language) cannot be used, but for the most part writing in a high level language is less error prone, less frustrating and much faster than assembly language.

Incidentally, my C routine to transpose all the bits in a byte takes 21 machine code instructions when compiled for a PIC16F876 and took me a couple of minutes to write.

73

Ray, G4FON

-----

Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 14:07:36 -0500

From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>  
To: lmairs@direcway.com  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>,  
radioham@gmx.co.uk  
Subject: [162342] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <3FCF85F8.3CBB209@erols.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Well now, U agree with both of you; ain't that strange. Over the 35 + years of my career I goth worked and managed hardware groups and wrote software.

My software period began in 1983 and lasted, with hardware interruptions, until 1993. I wrote software or took care of applications in both APL and Basic. I transferred two very significant applications from a System 370 to a desktop IBM PCs.

It is probably true that programmers who have written assembly language write tighter code and make better use of incline comments, but tight code is not as important in most computer applications as it used to be. Modern computers are almost never memory limited. The use of PIC's are memory limited, but they are a very recent development (at least the last 10 years). And comments are more a matter of discipline than the programming language in use. Just troubleshoot a program that is more than a year old and you understand the value of comments.

The PIC is utilized by a very few outside professional applications. Hobbyists tend to use "full size" PC's! These are far from being memory limited. Also remember the "sea change" that hit the computing business with Windows. The PC on your desk actually used to be used to compute; now it is used as a substitute for your telephone, your darkroom, and the games you play.

With Windows came a total reorganization of the software business. No longer was it important to write tight code, the compilers used by windows were not optimized for tight code! You didn't even have to have a background in programming to use the software!

So, you can see why I agree and disagree with both of you!

Bruce

-----

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 14:14:38 -0500

From: "Michael Pupeza" <mpupeza@sympatico.ca>  
To: "QRP-L" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162343] I Need a DL34M 4 digit LED display!  
Message-ID: <001501c3ba9a\$f1904640\$3f38d0d8@oemcomputer>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi All;  
My older A&A Engineering Frequency Counter has some burnt out LED Segments  
in the display.

If anyone can spare one, or a couple, and would be willing to pop them into  
an envelope and mail them to FL, I would be very appreciative and would send  
a few bucks for them.

DL34M

FYI they are a 4 digit common anode Bubble LED display, about the size and  
pins of a 14 pin DIP.

Contact my email directly, please.

Thanks for any help.

73

Mike VE3EQP/W4 (shortly!)

mpupeza@sympatico.ca

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 14:25:26 -0500  
From: "Mark Rauchfuss" <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>  
To: <n6kr@elecraft.com>,  
      '"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion'" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162344] RE: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure  
Message-ID: <000701c3ba9c\$63349200\$1f164b0c@LIFEB00K>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Again Wayne,

Thanks for the quick reply. I travel in Europe (Austria, Germany, Sweden  
Switzerland, and Italy) quite a lot, and normally I take a Grundig  
YB-400PE or an Icom PCR-10007 with me depending on whether I have my  
laptop with me. I enjoy the ability to listen to music and to the ham  
bands. But if my K2 could receive Short and Medium wave (including the  
equivalent to our FM bands) and wide band FM, well I'd be able to  
operate my K2 on my trips, as well. This would be really great.



Thanks again & 73s,

Mark

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU] On Behalf Of Wayne Burdick

Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 1:32 PM

To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion

Subject: Re: Elecraft KX1 Shortwave Listening Adventure

Mark Rauchfuss wrote:

> Why doesn't Elecraft create a version of the K2 with General Coverage  
> capability or perhaps an external GC or even a GC RX?

Hi Mark,

This is on our list.

Meanwhile, the KX1 makes a great pocket SWL receiver, and the K2 covers most of the popular SWL bands. It can even tune the high end of the AM broadcast band.

73,  
Wayne  
N6KR

--

<http://www.elecraft.com>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 13:38:27 -0600

From: "Michael Melland, W9WIS" <w9wis@charter.net>

To: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>

Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>

Subject: [162345] Re: "ET phone home" ?

Message-ID: <000701c3ba9e\$32e651e0\$4986e98d@winad.it.uwosh.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

ELF is used to communicate only with deep runners so it's a bit of a different purpose then what you are describing. I know that communications with subs as deep as 400+ feet is common...

I've also been told that most of the messages that are sent via ELF are launch codes etc. The ICBM boats can lay on the bottom and receive information without having to move at all. Must be like a high tech version of the EAM's often heard on the USAF Global HF Frequencies..... "Sky King Sky King do not answer.... message follows..."

Mike, W9WIS

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 14:39:50 -0500  
From: "Hare,Ed, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.org>  
To: "Doug Hendricks" <ki6ds@dpol.net>,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162346] RE: [Elecraft] Orion added to Elecraft rig RX comparison page  
Message-ID: <721D3436A7C2B344A301FD4A413C71A901735848@kosh.arrlhq.org>  
content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

> Guys, for clarification, my comments were not cynical at all,=20  
> they were  
> serious questions that I did not know the answer to, so I=20  
> asked. I also  
> never intended nor do I think that I implied that the integrity of the  
> principals involved was being questioned. Please do not=20  
> read things into  
> what I say. I think that I am fairly straight forward, and=20  
> if I were to  
> question someone's integrity, I would do it plainly for=20  
> everyone to see.

Having known Doug for a number of years, I will personally vouch for his integrity and candor. I took his question as just a question and=20 answered it as such. =20

Generally, QST would probably not review a rig by NORCAL. This is=20 nothing at all against NORCAL, because they have done some mighty fine

work, IMHO, but they generally do a run of kits, sell them off, and then they are no longer available. Most often, by the time the review got to print, the kit would not be in production. Short-run products, by any organization or manufacturer, are not good review candidates.

73,=20  
Ed Hare, W1RFI  
ARRL Lab  
225 Main St  
Newington, CT 06111  
Tel: 860-594-0318  
Internet: w1rfi@arrl.org  
Web: <http://www.arrl.org/tis>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Doug Hendricks [mailto:ki6ds@dpol.net]

> Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 10:09 AM

> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion

> Subject: Re: [Elecraft] Orion added to Elecraft rig RX comparison page

>=20

>=20

> Guys, for clarification, my comments were not cynical at all,=20

> they were

> serious questions that I did not know the answer to, so I=20

> asked. I also

> never intended nor do I think that I implied that the integrity of the

> principals involved was being questioned. Please do not=20

> read things into

> what I say. I think that I am fairly straight forward, and=20

> if I were to

> question someone's integrity, I would do it plainly for=20

> everyone to see.

>=20

> I don't know what NorCal products that have been reviewed by=20

> QST other than

> the SMK-1. This is how they got the SMK-1. I gave a kit to Joe

> Bottiglieri, AA1GW when he photographed Gary Diana and I at=20

> Dayton several

> years ago. Joe built the kit, and liked it so well that he=20

> wrote it up for

> a product review. I had no idea that he was going to a=20

> review when I gave

> it to him, it was just a gesture of kindness. I did a search=20

> on the web

> site and the only NorCal product that shows up is the SMK-1. =20  
> Bruce, no  
> other NorCal kit has ever been reviewed in a product review=20  
> by QST, go check  
> for yourself. Your comment that the League has reviewed=20  
> "several pieces of  
> NorCal equipment" is not true. They have reviewd one, the=20  
> SMK-1, and it was  
> not purchased anonymously, and I bet that Joe still has the=20  
> rig. Ahh, but  
> the casual reader of this may say I saw the Sierra, NorCal=20  
> 40A and the SST  
> mentioned in QST, I know I did. Yes you did, but those were=20  
> all Wilderness  
> Radio Kits, not NorCal kits. In fact many people mistakenly=20  
> believe that  
> the SST was a NorCal kit. It was not, Wilderness Radio has=20  
> been the only  
> vendor to sell an SST.  
>=20  
> I have never been contacted by the ARRL to provide any NorCal=20  
> kit for a  
> product review, so I have no knowledge of how the procedure works. I  
> believe that they worked through Wayne Burdick and Bob Dyer=20  
> on the Sierra,  
> NorCal 40A and the SST.  
>=20  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: "Bruce Muscolino" <w6toy@erols.com>  
> To: "Doug Hendricks" <ki6ds@dpol.net>  
> Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>  
> Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2003 4:30 PM  
> Subject: Re: [Elecraft] Orion added to Elecraft rig RX comparison page  
>=20  
>=20  
> > Doug, (and the group where applicable),  
> > >  
> > > Eric, I am addressing this to you via the list as I have=20  
> always wondered  
> > > about the ARRL testing procedure. How are the rigs=20  
> selected? Does the  
> > > manufacturer send a sample to them? Do they pick one at=20  
> random from a  
> > > dealer? It would seem to be easy to get an Orion from=20  
> Tentec having a  
> > > "blind" person buy it and then give it to the ARRL, just=20  
> as it would be  
> to

> > > have someone order a K2 and then build it and send to the ARRL for  
> testing.  
> > >  
> > Such a cynical view of the testing policies and procedures=20  
> used by the  
> > organization that has shown itself above question for=20  
> nearly a century.  
> > The league has published its review policies since about 1975 when a  
> > noted QRPer who worked for the ARRL at the time wrote a QST article  
> > explaining the policy. That was Bruce Williams, WA6IVC, SK, who was  
> > Product Review Editor back then.  
> >  
> > To avoid questions of honesty the League adopted the policy of NOT  
> > accepting equipment sent in for review. All review=20  
> equipment is bought  
> > by League employees from established ham equipment dealers. Retail  
> > price is paid for the equipment, and the dealer may or may=20  
> not recognize  
> > the buyer as a League employee. The purchaser then reviews the  
> > equipment for QST.  
> >  
> > After the review has been published the equipment is sold=20  
> to anybody via  
> > a sealed bid process. The use of the sealed bid process=20  
> means even the  
> > purchaser or builder has to win the competition to get the rig!  
> >  
> > If the item in question is a kit, the purchaser builds the item  
> > himself. They may use league lab facilities to build and test the  
> > unit, but the use of lab space is strictly not on working time.  
> >  
> > All product review tests are then performed on the unit by League  
> > staffers who generally have not been associated with the purchase or  
> > build of the unit. Product review numbers are the numbers=20  
> that have  
> > been obtained during these tests.  
> >  
> > If a unit receives a bad review it receives a bad review. =20  
> Manufacturers  
> > may repair the test unit, but the review is published as it=20  
> was tested  
> > before any repair is attempted. If the equipment warrants=20  
> it it may be  
> > reviewed again, with separate results published.  
> >  
> > In actual practice the unit that kicked off Bruce's article=20  
> was an MFJ  
> > product. After publication MFJ apparently went through the=20

> roof asking  
> > why they weren't given a chance to repair the unit before=20  
> the review was  
> > published. The response was something to the effect that=20  
> we don't do  
> > that. I understand it almost cost QST the advertisements!  
> >  
> > The League is honest. It is above reproach in this area. =20  
> There have  
> > been many articles published about their review procedures,=20  
> usually by  
> > the new Product Review Editor. Doug, you should know the=20  
> process, they  
> > have reviewed several pieces of NORCAL equipment!  
> >  
> > Bruce  
> >  
>=20  
>=20

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 14:50:37 -0500  
From: "Hare,Ed, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.org>  
To: <ai2q@adelphia.net>,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162347] RE: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"  
Message-ID: <721D3436A7C2B344A301FD4A413C71A9025121BB@kosh.arrlhq.org>  
content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The article was actually fairly positive, as these things go.

Unfortunately, BPL operates at the emissions limits in Part 15 -- 30 =  
uV/m at 30 m from the radiating source. The laws of physics predicts =  
that a halfwave dipole or HF Yagi placed in a 30 uV/m field will pick up =  
an S9-level signal. This will happen with any Part 15 radiator near =  
that antenna. In most cases, however, the interference potential from a =  
Part-15 device is local. We can and do hear devices in our neighbors' =  
houses, but typically not the ones from several blocks away. Most =  
Part-15 devices that generate "legal" signals do so on only a few =  
frequencies, and most are not on 24 hours a day. So 30 uV/m at 30 m =  
does help to limit the interference potential from Part-15 emitters.

How well can this apply to BPL? First, when a BPL system is built as =

large as entire community, all HF users within that community will have =  
part of the BPL system "next door," or on the power lines outside his or =  
her house. BPL systems don't just use a few narrowband frequencies, but =  
occupy tens of MHz of spectrum simultaneously. From what ARRL has seen, =  
they are not intermittent, but have some activity 24 hours a day. Trying =  
to apply Part-15 to BPL would be like trying to live with the noise of =  
the occasional airplane that passes overhead. What can be acceptable =  
for a few minutes once in a while in only portions of town would be =  
entirely unacceptable 24 hours a day at all locations simultaneously.=20

This is not just an amateur radio problem. BPL will use spectrum =  
allocated to amateur radio; shortwave broadcast; commercial; military =  
and into low VHF public-service communications channels. It will cause =  
a change in ambient noise levels of up to 60 or 70 dB, or more in some =  
cases where receiving antennas are located close to power-line wiring.=20

73,=20

Ed Hare, W1RFI

ARRL Lab

225 Main St

Newington, CT 06111

Tel: 860-594-0318

Internet: w1rfi@arrl.org

Web: <http://www.arrl.org/tis>

ARRL is the National Association for Amateur Radio. It is supported by =  
membership dues, individual contributions and the sale of publications =  
and advertising. For more information about ARRL, go to =  
<http://www.arrl.org/news/features/inside-your-league.html>. For more =  
information about membership, go to <http://www.arrl.org/join.html>. Your =  
contribution can also help support ARRL's ongoing efforts to protect =  
Amateur spectrum. Go to =  
<https://www.arrl.org/forms/development/donations/basic/> to learn more =  
about the ways you can support the ARRL programs and activities of most =  
importance to you. You can help ARRL protect Amateur Radio for you and =  
future generations to enjoy.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: AI2Q [mailto:ai2q@adelphia.net]

> Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 9:05 AM

> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion

> Subject: RE: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"

>=20

>=20

> Jeff:

>=20

> When you consider how many hams are engineers and technicians=20

> (who read  
> Electronic Design magazine----and who even work on its=20  
> staff), those of us  
> who are in the business should get on over to ED's Web site=20  
> and add our  
> comments. Every little bit of opposition helps.  
>=20  
> Vy 73, AI2Q, Alex in Kennebunk, Maine QRP-L #687  
> <http://users.adelphia.net/~alexmm/ai2q.htm>  
>=20  
> .-.-.  
>=20  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU=20  
> [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU]On Behalf Of  
> Jeff Furman  
> Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 2:36 AM  
> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
> Subject: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"  
>=20  
>=20  
> A brief mention of our problems is in the current issue of  
> "Electronic Design," a trade magazine for engineers:  
>=20  
> <http://www.elecdesign.com/Articles/Index.cfm?ArticleID=3D6850>  
>=20  
> They also solicit readers' comments.  
>=20  
> 73, AD6MX, Jeff  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20  
>=20

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 14:54:03 -0500  
From: "Goody K3NG" <k3ng@qrpis.org>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162348] OT: Cable Modem Interference  
Message-ID: <002901c3baa0\$5e7622c0\$33c893cd@corp.fast.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit



Use of HF frequencies on cable isn't a new thing. There's HF band video channels called T channels that are typically used for transmitting video in the reverse direction, towards the cable headend. You can see the frequencies here <http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/catv-ch.html> . When I was working in wireless cable back in the day, I heard use of these channels was avoided due to ingress interference from CB, Amateur Radio, etc. (Kind of ironic BPL is the same frequencies on an unshielded system :-). I presume cable companies used these low frequencies so they could bypass line amplifiers going in the reverse direction, and it would require minimal amplification due to low losses at these low frequencies, and of course, standard TVs can't receive them.

72

Goody

K3NG

----- Original Message -----

From: <wd8civ@att.net>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 06:48

Subject: Re: Cable Modem Interference

>  
> > I have to say, the level of training evident from this conversation was  
> > refreshing. Also, the tech's familiarity with the regs and recognizing  
> > ingress to be their problem, not mine, was a bit of a surprise.  
> >  
> > Now, why did they pick 10-Meters to run Road Runner???  
>  
> Keith,  
>  
> Because 11 meters is worse? (Grin)  
>  
> My guess is because it fits in the bandwidth of their system but is  
> outside of the frequencies that are used for television signals. This is  
only  
> a guess, though.  
>  
> Dave  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 14:12:35 -0600 (CST)

From: "Brian.Buydens@usask.ca" <buydens@duke.usask.ca>

To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: [162349] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.4.53.0312041401100.353358@duke.usask.ca>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I for one am enjoying this thread and I hope people keep it on list. I think it is relevant to the Elmer160 class.

Speaking of the old days... If I am not mistaken C was originally designed by Kernighan and Richie to be a language for systems programming on a PDP 8 or maybe it was a PDP 11. Anyway the language was supposed to be high level enough to allow ease of use while being low level enough to map many things directly into how the processor actually worked.

If I can recall, the debate in the late '70s and early '80s was whether C actually delivered this promise or if it was better to program in assembly. Now, 20 plus years later it seems we are still having the same debate, only now it is with microcontrollers. I am interested to see how this one will resolve itself. Perhaps history will repeat itself in that microcontrollers will get more powerful and this debate will become mute?

Plus ca change, plus c'est pareille!

Brian.

On Thu, 4 Dec 2003, Chuck Adams wrote:

> At 11:23 AM 12/4/2003 -0600, Dale Botkin wrote:  
>  
>  
> >...snip snip...  
> >Anyway, this is probably pretty OT for the QRP-L, so I'm willing to shut  
> >up on the subject and/or take it off-list if people are sick or hearing  
> >it.  
> >  
> The Elmer160 thread will allow a new generation to experience what it was  
> like back in the old days, except the development tools are now several orders  
> of magnitude better. It seems like cheating to sit down at a 2.0GHz system

Brian Buydens  
Veterinary Electronic Data Specialist  
Computing Services, University of Saskatchewan  
email: Brian.Buydens@usask.ca  
<http://duke.usask.ca/~buydens>  
VE5RDV

-----

I am a proud citizen of "Soviet Canuckistan"

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 13:59:17 -0700  
From: "M.M." <markem@cox.net>  
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU  
Subject: [162350] Antenna Compendium Vol 3  
Message-ID: <6.0.0.22.0.20031204135519.02676808@pop.west.cox.net>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I'm looking for an article that I think is in the ARRL Antenna Compendium, Vol 3. Anyone have a copy of this book and would be willing to check the index for me? I'm willing to buy it but I want to make sure it's the right one first. I haven't found the compendium indexes on the ARRL site (yet...).

Contact off-list would probably be best...

Thanks & 73...      Mark      AA7TA

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 16:11:08 -0500  
From: "Mark Rauchfuss" <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>  
To: <k7qo@commspeed.net>,  
     "'Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion'" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162351] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <001401c3baab\$27a2cae0\$1f164b0c@LIFEB00K>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
              charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Actually, I find it to be very interesting. In the old days (6801U4, 68HC-11) it was essential to write code that achieved the highest level of density and that not one bit was wasted.

I have found that in recent years in the 32 bit automotive universe with the movement to model based engineering using Matlab, Simulink (controller models) and Stateflow (state machines) that everyone finds

computational and memory resources to be "cheap" and hand-written (and, of course, auto generated) code gets very sloppy and there is a lot of waste (resources). The most efficient 32 bit software engineers come from the 4,8 and 16 bit universe!

However, in the automotive 4, 8 and 16 bit universe, this ain't so. Good engineers fight for every bit...and it is absolutely essential to do so since this is an industry that counts fractions of pennies.

Just my two cents...

Mark

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU] On Behalf Of Chuck Adams  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 2:01 PM  
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
Subject: RE: [Elmer160] C compilers

At 11:23 AM 12/4/2003 -0600, Dale Botkin wrote:

>...snip snip...  
>Anyway, this is probably pretty OT for the QRP-L, so I'm willing to shut  
>up on the subject and/or take it off-list if people are sick or hearing  
>it.  
>  
>73,  
>Dale

Dale et.al.,

Well written and I agree with the need for assembly language understanding and the architecture of a processor. It is not off topic for the discussion.  
Just as long as we don't get into flame wars on what is the best.

John M. picked the Microchip architecture to do and he has a hard row to hoe over the next year. But he stepped forward and is doing the job. You can't do any better than that.

Some will argue that newbies should go with Atmel or other uPs. If you think that, then step forward and do a course.

Time has passed long enough that a majority of this group (and the world) wasn't there in the 70's when we had to build systems like the Altair 8800, SWTP 6800 and 6809 systems, and others. There were no hard drives, much less floppy discs, etc. We used front panel switches to load loaders and then used things like Oliver Audio Engineering optical paper tape readers to pull by hand the paper tape through to load a BASIC interpreter. I still have in the museum an autographed copy from Bill Gates. Systems ran at clock speeds of 1MHz (NOT GHz) We wrote monitors for 1K (that's not M) of ROM if we were lucky enough to have the latest EPROM memory. We used things like the Kansas City Standard to store programs onto audio cassette (audio tones to store the ASCII codes, one tone for 1 and one tone for 0). We should write some code to do the same thing using the new CD recorders.... :-) Any have the Kansas City standard notes? Harold Mauch (Percom Data systems. SK) and others be proud of us.

The Elmer160 thread will allow a new generation to experience what it was like back in the old days, except the development tools are now several orders of magnitude better. It seems like cheating to sit down at a 2.0GHz system with 1.0GB of ram and 120GB hard drives and do this stuff..... :-) Some of us went through a lot of trouble using an IBM 360/65 main frame to create a mag tape to take to a PDP-11/20 and punch a paper tape to read into the microprocessor system in a corner attached to a Tektronix raster display terminal that cost more than some people made in a year. :-) I wrote the cross-assembler in IBM 360 assembly language. That was what you'd call home brewing..... The cycle time on the extended memory for the main frame was 500 microseconds.

QRP rigs are beginning more and more to rely on uPs. You'll note that Elecraft and Small Wonder Labs both use Microchip processors. Steve Weber uses the Atmel processors, but he doesn't do large production runs that I have seen in his designs. Elmer160 allows many of us the opportunity to get hands on experience in doing things like write code for a keyer, etc. I'm sure new applications will come from the project. Heck, maybe even some new kits for all of us to enjoy and play with.

FYI

Chuck Adams K7QO k7qo@commspeed.net  
http://www.qsl.net/k7qo CP-60

Moving to Arizona? Please bring your own water.

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 15:12:21 -0600 (CST)  
From: Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>  
To: Ray Goff <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162352] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0312041434350.28933-100000@madmax.botkin.org>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Thu, 4 Dec 2003, Ray Goff wrote:

> You can always find examples of situation where C (or any other high  
> level language) cannot be used, but for the most part writing in a  
> high level language is less error prone, less frustrating and much  
> faster than assembly language.

Exactly my point, really. On most of this I think we're in violent  
agreement. 8-) That's why I use C, with the occasional function done  
with inline assembly.

> Incidentally, my C routine to transpose all the bits in a byte takes  
> 21 machine code instructions when compiled for a PIC16F876 and took me  
> a couple of minutes to write.

11 instructions, thus allowing me to add a prosign for pausing message  
playback to, for example, insert RST or a sequence number. You work  
really, really hard when you absolutely have to make it fit into 1K. 8-)

73,  
Dale  
--

It's a thankless job, but I've got a lot of Karma to burn off.  
PicoKeyer Analog with pot speed control now available! Or add  
memory and more to your Rock-Mite -- <http://www.hamgadgets.com>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 13:21:09 -0800  
From: "Andreas Junge - ARRL.NET" <n6nu@arrl.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162353] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <HPEPKMGBOBPNPFCOKLJGMEPHFBAA.n6nu@arrl.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Interesting to see how C has survived for so long. And yes, I am making a living programming PIC controllers with C and occasional inline Assembler. To ME, C applications are easier to maintain.

And what happens when you outgrow that one processor and want to change to a different model or even manufacturer? Try that with assembler.

It's a matter of picking the right tool for the right application depending on your abilities. If you can you get the job done with C - do it in C. You like Assembler better - do it in Assembler. Maybe you have to mix C/Assembler. There is no one solution. It's like Chevy/Ford, Code/NoCode.

I am using the full version of the HiTech compiler that is shipped with the Microchip starter kit and it is a high quality one. It integrates very nicely with the Microchip IDE - MPLAB.

Just my thoughts,

Andreas, N6NU

>  
> I for one am enjoying this thread and I hope people keep it on list. I  
> think it is relevant to the Elmer160 class.  
>  
> Speaking of the old days... If I am not mistaken C was originally designed  
> by Kernighan and Richie to be a language for systems programming on a PDP  
> 8 or maybe it was a PDP 11. Anyway the language was supposed to be high  
> level enough to allow ease of use while being low level enough to map many  
> things directly into how the processor actually worked.  
>  
> If I can recall, the debate in the late '70s and early '80s was whether  
> C actually delivered this promise or if it was better to program in  
> assembly. Now, 20 plus years later it seems we are still having the same  
> debate, only now it is with microcontrollers. I am interested to see how  
> this one will resolve itself. Perhaps history will repeat itself in that

> microcontrollers will get more powerful and this debate will become mute?  
>  
> Plus ca change, plus c'est pareille!  
>  
> Brian.  
>  
> On Thu, 4 Dec 2003, Chuck Adams wrote:  
>  
> > At 11:23 AM 12/4/2003 -0600, Dale Botkin wrote:  
> >  
> >  
> > >...snip snip...  
> > >Anyway, this is probably pretty OT for the QRP-L, so I'm  
> willing to shut  
> > >up on the subject and/or take it off-list if people are sick or hearing  
> > >it.  
> > >  
> > The Elmer160 thread will allow a new generation to experience  
> what it was  
> > like back in the old days, except the development tools are now  
> several orders  
> > of magnitude better. It seems like cheating to sit down at a  
> 2.0GHz system  
>  
>  
> Brian Buydens  
> Veterinary Electronic Data Specialist  
> Computing Services, University of Saskatchewan  
> email: Brian.Buydens@usask.ca  
> http://duke.usask.ca/~buydens  
> VE5RDV  
>  
> -----  
> I am a proud citizen of "Soviet Canuckistan"  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 16:23:20 -0500  
From: "Mark Rauchfuss" <mark.rauchfuss@worldnet.att.net>  
To: <w1rfi@arrl.org>,  
    "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162354] RE: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"



Message-ID: <001701c3baac\$db775d00\$1f164b0c@LIFEB00K>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Ed,

BPL will also affect any receiver with a first or second IF that happen to fall within the BPL frequency allocation...and this means virtually ALL receivers!

Keep up the great work & 73s,

Mark

-----Original Message-----

From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU] On Behalf Of Hare,Ed, W1RFI  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 2:51 PM  
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
Subject: RE: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"

The article was actually fairly positive, as these things go.

Unfortunately, BPL operates at the emissions limits in Part 15 -- 30 uV/m at 30 m from the radiating source. The laws of physics predicts that a halfwave dipole or HF Yagi placed in a 30 uV/m field will pick up an S9-level signal. This will happen with any Part 15 radiator near that antenna. In most cases, however, the interference potential from a Part-15 device is local. We can and do hear devices in our neighbors' houses, but typically not the ones from several blocks away. Most Part-15 devices that generate "legal" signals do so on only a few frequencies, and most are not on 24 hours a day. So 30 uV/m at 30 m does help to limit the interference potential from Part-15 emitters.

How well can this apply to BPL? First, when a BPL system is built as large as entire community, all HF users within that community will have part of the BPL system "next door," or on the power lines outside his or her house. BPL systems don't just use a few narrowband frequencies, but occupy tens of MHz of spectrum simultaneously. From what ARRL has seen, they are not intermittent, but have some activity 24 hours a day. Trying to apply Part-15 to BPL would be like trying to live with the noise of the occasional airplane that passes overhead. What can be acceptable for a few minutes once in a while in only portions of town would be entirely unacceptable 24 hours a day at all locations simultaneously.

This is not just an amateur radio problem. BPL will use spectrum allocated to amateur radio; shortwave broadcast; commercial; military and into low VHF public-service communications channels. It will cause a change in ambient noise levels of up to 60 or 70 dB, or more in some cases where receiving antennas are located close to power-line wiring.

73,

Ed Hare, W1RFI

ARRL Lab

225 Main St

Newington, CT 06111

Tel: 860-594-0318

Internet: w1rfi@arrl.org

Web: <http://www.arrl.org/tis>

ARRL is the National Association for Amateur Radio. It is supported by membership dues, individual contributions and the sale of publications and advertising. For more information about ARRL, go to <http://www.arrl.org/news/features/inside-your-league.html>. For more information about membership, go to <http://www.arrl.org/join.html>. Your contribution can also help support ARRL's ongoing efforts to protect Amateur spectrum. Go to <https://www.arrl.org/forms/development/donations/basic/> to learn more about the ways you can support the ARRL programs and activities of most importance to you. You can help ARRL protect Amateur Radio for you and future generations to enjoy.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: AI2Q [mailto:[ai2q@adelphia.net](mailto:ai2q@adelphia.net)]

> Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 9:05 AM

> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion

> Subject: RE: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"

>

>

> Jeff:

>

> When you consider how many hams are engineers and technicians

> (who read

> Electronic Design magazine----and who even work on its

> staff), those of us

> who are in the business should get on over to ED's Web site

> and add our

> comments. Every little bit of opposition helps.

>

> Vy 73, AI2Q, Alex in Kennebunk, Maine QRP-L #687

> <http://users.adelphia.net/~alexmm/ai2q.htm>

>

> .-.-.  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU  
> [mailto:owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU]On Behalf Of  
> Jeff Furman  
> Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 2:36 AM  
> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
> Subject: BPL article in Nov. 24 "Electronic Design"  
>  
>  
> A brief mention of our problems is in the current issue of  
> "Electronic Design," a trade magazine for engineers:  
>  
> <http://www.elecdesign.com/Articles/Index.cfm?ArticleID=6850>  
>  
> They also solicit readers' comments.  
>  
> 73, AD6MX, Jeff  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 16:24:36 -0500  
From: "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162355] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <006201c3baad\$04dc4980\$090044c0@BrianBoru>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
                charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Man, am I glad the XYL dragged me shopping today. I would have spent all day responding to emails. Instead, Chuck and Dale did the job for me, and the XYL is a bunch happier. Thanks guys!

And this really is a good discussion. There are 1000 ways to skin a cat, and if you have the long history that some of us have, more of those ways are realistic than for folks with less background. The PIC is pretty simple, and it's a good way for folks who don't have the long background get

in there. Assembler code is a pain to maintain, especially if it gets very big, but mostly we'll be doing little things, and it will help folks get a really good feel for the architecture. I suspect those of us that have seen dozens of processors could get away with a decent job in C or COBOL, for that matter, without a lot of insight into the particular architecture. But we ain't the guys this thing is aimed at.

It looks like most of the folks have relatively little idea of what's going on under the covers. By doing the course in assembler, they get to see that up close and personal, rather than through the filters of software layers. It's a little like the whole processor choice thing. The 628 is way more powerful, and cheaper, the 819 is cheaper AND has on board A/D, but they all have these complicating factors that are lacking in the 84. So lets get folks up to speed in a simple environment, nice and close to the metal, and when they need that A/D they will know enough to reach for an '877 or whatever. When they decide to solve systems of differential equations, they'll figure out that's a whole lot easier in C. But at least they will have the foundation.

72/73 de WB8RCR      <http://www.qsl.net/wb8rcr>  
didileydadidah      QRP-L #1446 Code Warriors #35

----- Original Message -----

From: "Chuck Adams" <k7qo@commspeed.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 2:00 PM  
Subject: RE: [Elmer160] C compilers

> At 11:23 AM 12/4/2003 -0600, Dale Botkin wrote:  
>  
>  
> >...snip snip...  
> >Anyway, this is probably pretty OT for the QRP-L, so I'm willing to shut  
> >up on the subject and/or take it off-list if people are sick or hearing  
> >it.  
> >  
> >73,  
> >Dale  
>  
> Dale et.al.,  
>  
> Well written and I agree with the need for assembly language understanding  
> and the architecture of a processor. It is not off topic for the  
discussion.  
> Just as long as we don't get into flame wars on what is the best.  
>

> John M. picked the Microchip architecture to do and he has a hard row  
> to hoe over the next year. But he stepped forward and is doing the job.  
> You can't do any better than that.  
>  
> Some will argue that newbies should go with Atmel or other uPs. If you  
> think that, then step forward and do a course.  
>  
> Time has passed long enough that a majority of this group (and the world)  
> wasn't there  
> in the 70's when we had to build systems like the Altair 8800, SWTP 6800  
> and 6809 systems, and others. There were no hard drives, much less  
> floppy discs, etc. We used front panel switches to load loaders and then  
> used things like Oliver Audio Engineering optical paper tape readers to  
> pull by hand the paper tape through to load a BASIC interpreter. I still  
> have in the museum an autographed copy from Bill Gates. Systems  
> ran at clock speeds of 1MHz (NOT GHz) We wrote monitors for 1K (that's  
not M)  
> of ROM if we were lucky enough to have the latest EPROM memory.  
> We used things like the Kansas City Standard to store programs onto  
> audio cassette (audio tones to store the ASCII codes, one tone for 1 and  
> one tone for 0). We should write some code to do the same thing  
> using the new CD recorders.... :-) Any have the Kansas City standard  
notes?  
> Harold Mauch (Percom Data systems. SK) and others be proud of us.  
>  
> The Elmer160 thread will allow a new generation to experience what it was  
> like back in the old days, except the development tools are now several  
orders  
> of magnitude better. It seems like cheating to sit down at a 2.0GHz  
system  
> with 1.0GB of ram and 120GB hard drives and do this stuff..... :-) Some  
of us  
> went through a lot of trouble using an IBM 360/65 main frame to create a  
> mag tape to take to a PDP-11/20 and punch a paper tape to read into  
> the microprocessor system in a corner attached to a Tektronix raster  
> display terminal that cost more than some people made in a year. :-)  
> I wrote the cross-assembler in IBM 360 assembly language. That was  
> what you'd call home brewing..... The cycle time on the extended memory  
> for the main frame was 500 microseconds.  
>  
> QRP rigs are beginning more and more to rely on uPs. You'll note that  
> Elecraft and Small Wonder Labs both use Microchip processors. Steve  
> Weber uses the Atmel processors, but he doesn't do large production  
> runs that I have seen in his designs. Elmer160 allows many of us the  
> opportunity to gets hands on experience in doing things like write code  
> for a keyer, etc. I'm sure new applications will come from the project.  
> Heck, maybe even some new kits for all of us to enjoy and play with.  
>

>  
> FYI  
>  
>  
>  
> Chuck Adams K7QO k7qo@commspeed.net  
> http://www.qsl.net/k7qo CP-60  
>  
> Moving to Arizona? Please bring your own water.  
>  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 21:31:14 -0000  
From: "Ray Goff" <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
To: <buydens@duke.usask.ca>,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162356] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <FDEOKGEJJFNPABJIJGDDAEIJHAAA.radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> If I can recall, the debate in the late '70s and early '80s was whether  
> C actually delivered this promise or if it was better to program in  
> assembly. Now, 20 plus years later it seems we are still having the same  
> debate, only now it is with microcontrollers. I am interested to see how  
> this one will resolve itself. Perhaps history will repeat itself in that  
> microcontrollers will get more powerful and this debate will become mute?  
>

Brian,

I think the difference between now and the late 1970's is that C compilers have become much more sophisticated. Lots and lots of work has been done on code optimisation, which means that if you have a good compiler not only will it create tight code, but it will also spot your coding inefficiencies and optimise them out for you.

I started coding in C in around 1981 when Dr Dobbs Journal published Ron Cain's small C compiler, prior to that I had been writing in assembly code for a whole range of devices. For the most part the Dr Dobbs compiler worked but you really would not want to look too closely at the code. There were plenty of situations where the compiler produced code to load the same variable into the same

register several times before making use of it.

Fortunately those days have gone, the CCS compiler, for example, will not create assembly code for functions which are not actually referenced in the code.

To my mind, the big advantage is that over the years I have learned to write good tight C code and now I leave it up to the compiler writer to take that code and generate optimised assembly code from it. I don't have to worry about the differences in register addressing between different microprocessors so that I can get the last ounce of power out of the microprocessor. I don't need to understand which bits to set in order to turn a generic input/output port into output mode, I simply call the C library function and it is take care of for me. Does that make me a bad programmer, I think not, it saves me from the distractions of the underlying hardware and the frustration that comes from mis-reading the datasheet.

There will always be a place for dedicated assembly language for microprocessor applications where the last byte and the last machine cycle counts, but for general ham use, I contend that a high level language is a much better approach to the programming.

All power to those stepping out on the Elmer 160 course, the challenge of getting a microprocessor to do what you want it to do, rather than zip off into cyberspace is always fun whether you do it in assembler or a high level language.

73

Ray, G4FON

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 16:33:35 -0500  
From: "John J. McDonough" <wb8rcr@arrl.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Cc: <buydens@duke.usask.ca>  
Subject: [162357] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <006e01c3baae\$460144f0\$090044c0@BrianBoru>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

----- Original Message -----

From: "Brian.Buydens@usask.ca" <buydens@duke.usask.ca>  
Subject: RE: [Elmer160] C compilers

> Anyway the language was supposed to be high  
> level enough to allow ease of use while being low level enough to map many  
> things directly into how the processor actually worked.

Actually, people still accuse C of being a write only language!

But I still tend to listen to the words of the song (to the tune of "Let it be")

When I find my code in tons of trouble  
Friends and colleagues come to me  
Speaking words of wisdom  
Write in C

When the deadline's fast approaching  
And bugs are all that I can see  
Somewhere someone whispers  
Write in C

Write in C, Write in C, Write in C, Write in C,  
BASIC is for sissies, write in C

I used to write a lot of FORTRAN  
For science it worked flawlessly  
Try using it for graphics  
Write in C

etc...

72/73 de WB8RCR      <http://www.qsl.net/wb8rcr>  
didileydadidah      QRP-L #1446 Code Warriors #35

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 15:35:59 -0600 (CST)  
From: Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>  
To: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162358] Re: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0312041526380.29028-100000@madmax.botkin.org>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII



On Thu, 4 Dec 2003, Bruce Muscolino wrote:

```
> It is probably true that programmers who have written assembly language
> write tighter code and make better use of inline comments, but tight
> code is not as important in most computer applications as it used to
> be. Modern computers are almost never memory limited.
8< snip...
> So, you can see why I agree and disagree with both of you!
```

Yep, and so do I. 8-)

I have two applications that illustrate the point perfectly. One uses a 16F877, is a couple thousand lines of C, does a menu driven user interface on an LCD, real time clock, floating point math, complex calculations, table lookups, measures the speed of a rotating sensor, the works. Not a line of assembly code in it, anywhere. It's perfectly comfortable in 8K of program space with about 10% to spare, performance is not an issue at 20 MHz, life is good.

The other lives in a 12F629 or 12F675, uses literally every single available program memory location, and cannot be ported to any other chip. I had to drop to inline ASM in half a dozen places to get it to the state it's in now, and every time I want to change something I have to make room somewhere... so the code gets gone over often.

The first one I could do even if I knew nothing of PIC assembler... but definitely not the second, no way. In fact, any sane person would have used ASM in the first place -- but while I can read ASM fine, I can't write it worth squat in any serious quantity.

73,  
Dale

--

It's a thankless job, but I've got a lot of Karma to burn off.  
PicoKeyer Analog with pot speed control now available! Or add  
memory and more to your Rock-Mite -- <http://www.hamgadgets.com>

-----

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 21:38:21 -0000  
From: "Ray Goff" <[radioham@gmx.co.uk](mailto:radioham@gmx.co.uk)>  
To: "Dale Botkin" <[dale@botkin.org](mailto:dale@botkin.org)>, "Ray Goff" <[radioham@gmx.co.uk](mailto:radioham@gmx.co.uk)>  
Cc: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <[qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU](mailto:qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU)>  
Subject: [162359] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <[FDEOKGEJJFNPABJIJGDDIEIJHAAA.radioham@gmx.co.uk](mailto:FDEOKGEJJFNPABJIJGDDIEIJHAAA.radioham@gmx.co.uk)>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> 11 instructions, thus allowing me to add a prosign for pausing message  
> playback to, for example, insert RST or a sequence number. You work  
> really, really hard when you absolutely have to make it fit into 1K. 8-)

I thought of an optimisation which got mine down to 19 instructions (18 if I do it inline and not as a subroutine), but you didn't say how much time you spent crafting your 11 instruction routine. I contend that if you don't need to get the last byte out of the chip the extra time spent isn't worth it?

73

Ray, G4FON

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 15:48:53 -0600 (CST)  
From: Dale Botkin <dale@botkin.org>  
To: Ray Goff <radioham@gmx.co.uk>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162360] RE: [Elmer160] C compilers  
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.33.0312041543330.29028-100000@madmax.botkin.org>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Thu, 4 Dec 2003, Ray Goff wrote:

> > 11 instructions, thus allowing me to add a prosign for pausing message  
> > playback to, for example, insert RST or a sequence number. You work  
> > really, really hard when you absolutely have to make it fit into 1K. 8-)  
>  
> I thought of an optimisation which got mine down to 19 instructions  
> (18 if I do it inline and not as a subroutine), but you didn't say how  
> much time you spent crafting your 11 instruction routine. I contend  
> that if you don't need to get the last byte out of the chip the extra  
> time spent isn't worth it?

About 10 minutes, maybe a little less, and if I didn't need those last few words of program space I wouldn't have. Oh - did I mention it's not a whole byte, but a variable number of BITS that need to be reversed, and with one extra bit set? Once again we stridently agree. 8-)

```
char morse, length, scratch, x;
```

```
bit_set(morse,0);  
for(x=0;x<length;x++) {  
    #asm  
    RRF scratch,F  
    RLF morse,F  
    #endasm  
}
```

73,  
Dale

--

It's a thankless job, but I've got a lot of Karma to burn off.  
PicoKeyer Analog with pot speed control now available! Or add  
memory and more to your Rock-Mite -- <http://www.hamgadgets.com>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 16:21:55 -0600  
From: <k6whp@verizon.net>  
To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162361] PSK31 on PDA Device?  
Message-ID: <20031204222155.JQB012902.out004.verizon.net@outgoing.verizon.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sorry for redundant bandwidth but I have come to the realization that my laptop is  
\*far\* too cumbersome to lug to the field and I was wondering if anyone had  
recommendations for smaller, lighter, kinder, gentler devices for doing PSK-31?  
Are there new PDAs on the market that could be used for this purpose?

My thanks in advance for any help.

72,

Bill, K6WHP

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 15:32:51 -0700 (MST)  
From: Karl Larsen <k5di@zianet.com>  
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu  
Subject: [162362] Paddle making hints  
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.44.0312041519430.4699-1000000@bucket.dog>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

If you are buying the ScQRPion paddle what you get is a bag of parts and some brass cut from stock with a saw. You can put it together without sanding a thing and it will be a working paddle.

But since I am a ScQRPion I want mine to be pretty. I just got back from Home Depot and it took 30 minutes to find the stuff. I can maybe save you some time.

First go to Tools and you will find a huge number of sandpapers in bins. I got Norton (Blue back) 9x11 sheets Metal Sanding assorted grits for \$4.48. Nearby is paint and you MUST get a salesperson who can open the spraypaint locker. I got Rust-Oleum Specialty Lacquer High Luster Coating \$3.97.

None of the sales people had ever heard of MASS. It comes in a Blue and Silver box with MASS Metal Polishing Creme \$4.96. This was in the Garden area of my store...

I hope this helps.

--

- Karl Larsen k5di Las Cruces,NM Az ScQRPions -

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 16:33:03 -0600  
From: "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>  
To: <Qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162363] VLF simple receiver, was ET phone home  
Message-ID: <029b01c3bab6\$94c330a0\$4e100a0a@rohredt2000>

Joe,  
Good work! With the 1962 QST, p. 36, Oct. one can see how to do a simple NAA receiver, for listening to the high power Navy stations.

Some of the high power stations like the ones at Annapolis have closed.

AFAIK, the ones in Cutler Maine, and in Washington state are still active and used.

Thanks and 73,

Stuart K5KVH

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 14:45:48 -0800  
From: "Lyle Johnson" <wa7gxd@fidalgo.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162364] RE: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
Message-ID: <NEBBKGGNGLGOHDJKFAPHMEJJFEAA.wa7gxd@fidalgo.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
                charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Sorry for redundant bandwidth but I have come to the realization  
> that my laptop is \*far\* too cumbersome to lug to the field and I  
> was wondering if anyone had recommendations for smaller, lighter,  
> kinder, gentler devices for doing PSK-31? Are there new PDAs on  
> the market that could be used for this purpose?

The Micro908 project from AmQRP looks like it will have a way to handle  
PSK31 without a laptop or PDA...

One problem with using a PDA for this sort of thing is that the CPU can't  
sleep much if it is doing all the DSP work, so the batteries quickly  
discharge. If a rig had a PSK31 system built in such that it only needed an  
ASCII terminal, then an old TRS80 model 100 or NEC 8201A would give days of  
battery life, or a Poqet PC would give many hours and not be too cumbersome.

72,

Lyle KK7P

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 18:07:19 -0500  
From: w2bvh <w2bvh@comcast.net>  
To: njqrp@njqrp.org,  
        Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>,  
Subject: [162365] Looking for an old Handbook cd to send to a new friend  
Message-ID: <3FCFBE27.6090209@comcast.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi,

A new friend, Ciro, C06CR, who I just met on 14070 psk asked me if I have an old copy of the Handbook CD. I don't, but I promised him I'd ask around the mailing lists.

If someone has an old Handbook CD they'd be willing to part with, I'm sure Ciro would be very appreciative. He's currently using a '70s vintage German made rig that was designed for 40 meter operation. He modified its PLL for 20 meter operation without having a schematic! A pretty resourceful fellow.

His rig produces no psk output at all with low audio drive, and then when it finally does output, it has an IMD of -8 or higher and 3 or 4 visible sideband pairs. I'm sure he's looking for a way to improve this situation.

Anyway, if you do have a cd you can part with, send it direct to him at his QRZ.COM address, or send it to me and I'll forward it.

73 and Season's Greetings,  
Lenny W2BVH

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 18:06:52 -0500  
From: "Paul Womble" <pwomble@earthlink.net>  
To: "'Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion'" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162366] RE: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <001d01c3babb\$4e2a94d0\$6401a8c0@house>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Now the waiting begins for list #2.

Or maybe #3!

Paul K4FB

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU]  
> On Behalf Of Jerry Haigwood  
> Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 12:21 PM  
> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
> Subject: Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List

>  
> Lee,  
> You are in the middle of batch 2 - about S/N 155 or so. Jerry W5JH  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 18:17:29 -0500  
From: "Tim Kass" <timkass@hotmail.com>  
To: w5jh@swlink.net, qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU  
Subject: [162367] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <BAY2-F68PUtf5AyPMiR0000ab0d@hotmail.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

LUCKY DOG! 72/72 K8WBL - mine is probably lost.....hi hi

>From: Jerry Haigwood <w5jh@swlink.net>  
>Reply-To: w5jh@swlink.net  
>To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
>Subject: Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
>Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 10:20:37 -0700  
>  
>Lee Mairs wrote:  
>  
> > Geez! My number still isn't posted, and I've been practicing polishing  
>and  
> > sanding brass all week...  
> >  
> > Jerry, you guys are doing a great job with this kit. It's popularity is  
>an  
> > indicator of the debt that the rest of us owe you for making this  
> > opportunity available to. You sure have my thanks!  
> > 73 de Lee  
> > KM4YY/8  
> >  
>  
>Lee,  
> You are in the middle of batch 2 - about S/N 155 or so.  
>Jerry W5JH  
>  
>

-----  
Don't worry if your Inbox will max out while you are enjoying the holidays.  
Get MSN Extra Storage! <http://join.msn.com/?PAGE=features/es>

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 15:20:27 -0800  
From: "Bill Smith" <billsmith@ispwest.com>  
To: <wa7gxd@fidalgo.net>,  
"Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>  
Subject: [162368] Re: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
Message-ID: <00a601c3babd\$385e5f40\$0200a8c0@HBC0>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

There is a VT-100 terminal emulation program available for palm devices. Is  
in the \$30 range, but you also need a serial cable for a similar amount.

Problem is the encoder/decoder (TU) hardware. Seems that development in  
that direction has all but stopped in the last two years, with efforts  
redirected toward soundcard program development. Am not sure \*all\* has  
stopped, but don't know of any simple TU solution.

I'd also like to see a MT-63 hardware TU. Also, the PSK-40 is not  
available at this time, and don't know of a simple SSB transceiver which  
could replace it.

Bill

----- Original Message -----

From: Lyle Johnson  
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 2:45 PM  
Subject: RE: PSK31 on PDA Device?

> Sorry for redundant bandwidth but I have come to the realization  
> that my laptop is \*far\* too cumbersome to lug to the field and I  
> was wondering if anyone had recommendations for smaller, lighter,  
> kinder, gentler devices for doing PSK-31? Are there new PDAs on  
> the market that could be used for this purpose?

The Micro908 project from AmQRP looks like it will have a way to handle



PSK31 without a laptop or PDA...

One problem with using a PDA for this sort of thing is that the CPU can't sleep much if it is doing all the DSP work, so the batteries quickly discharge. If a rig had a PSK31 system built in such that it only needed an ASCII terminal, then an old TRS80 model 100 or NEC 8201A would give days of battery life, or a Poqet PC would give many hours and not be too cumbersome.

72,

Lyle KK7P

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 18:28:13 -0500 (EST)  
From: Thom LaCosta <baltimoremd@baltimoremd.com>  
To: John Sielke <jsielke@pobox.com>  
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162369] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <20031204182701.C93365-1000000@unix1.vhost.min.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Thu, 4 Dec 2003, John Sielke wrote:

> Whooppee! I made it! Serial Number 66!

Has to be be that Jersey Devil at work!

Hopefully I'll make the second batch....and I'll have more time to find one of them old time solder melter deals.

Thom

|   |  |
|---|--|
| baltimoremd@baltimoremd.com   | Thom LaCosta K3HRN Webmaster           |
| <a href="http://www.baltimoremd.com/">http://www.baltimoremd.com/</a>   | Baltimore's Home Page                  |
| <a href="http://www.baltimorehon.com/">http://www.baltimorehon.com/</a> | Home of the Baltimore Lexicon          |
| <a href="http://www.zerobeat.net">http://www.zerobeat.net</a>           | Home of The QRP Web Ring and DrakeList |
| <a href="http://www.tlchost.net">http://www.tlchost.net</a>             | Web Hosting as low as \$3.49/month     |

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 15:34:40 -0800  
From: "richqrp" <richqrp@cox.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162370] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List

Message-ID: <007401c3babf\$307fd630\$c1770744@wd6fddstssz5sg>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

And I thought mine was going to be on the next list also.. but somehow ended up with 33. I guess the pony was riding extra hard the day it was mailed.. and the funniest thing about this is, some said we could live without it.. and now , we are on the third list already.. A job well done to all that were involved... I just knew, I HAD TO HAVE ONE.. no matter what is was.. when it was first announced , Doug did a good sell job.. 73's Rich,  
#33.....

----- Original Message -----

From: "Paul Womble" <pwomble@earthlink.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 3:06 PM  
Subject: RE: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List

> Now the waiting begins for list #2.

>

> Or maybe #3!

>

> Paul K4FB

>

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU]

> > On Behalf Of Jerry Haigwood

> > Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 12:21 PM

> > To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion

> > Subject: Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List

>

> >

> > Lee,

> > You are in the middle of batch 2 - about S/N 155 or so. Jerry W5JH

> >

> >

> >

>

-----

Date: Thu, 04 Dec 2003 18:42:03 -0500

From: Barry Minsky <barry@w2bj.com>

To: <w5jh@swlink.net>,

Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>

Subject: [162371] Re: AZ ScQRPions Paddle S/N List  
Message-ID: <BBF5307B.35B%barry@w2bj.com>  
Mime-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

On 12/4/03 9:08 AM, "Jerry Haigwood" <w5jh@swlink.net> wrote:

> Folks,  
>     The latest S/N list has been posted to the web. To check for your  
> name, go to:  
> <<http://www.swlink.net/~w5jh/brasspaddle.htm>> and then click on "serial  
> numbers list." On Saturday we will start cutting brass for batch 2 and  
> hope to be shipping it around December 20.

>  
> Jerry W5JH

>  
>  
>  
I was surprised that I was not on the list. Maybe I will be in the next batch.

Barry, W2BJ

-----  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 15:45:13 -0800  
From: "Lyle Johnson" <wa7gxd@fidalgo.net>  
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>  
Subject: [162372] RE: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
Message-ID: <NEBBKGGNGLGOHDJKFAPHKEJLFEAA.wa7gxd@fidalgo.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
          charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The ShineMicro SM2496 would have been ideal. It was a DSP plug-in for a Handspring Visor, and did 1200 and 9600 bps packet, APRS, etc. Even had open source DSP code! But Handspring cancelled the Springboard expansion slot about the time ShineMicro was releasing their product...

Lyle

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU [mailto:owner-qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU] On Behalf Of  
> Bill Smith  
> Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 3:20 PM

> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
> Subject: Re: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
>  
>  
> There is a VT-100 terminal emulation program available for palm  
> devices. Is  
> in the \$30 range, but you also need a serial cable for a similar amount.  
>  
> Problem is the encoder/decoder (TU) hardware. Seems that development in  
> that direction has all but stopped in the last two years, with efforts  
> redirected toward soundcard program development. Am not sure \*all\* has  
> stopped, but don't know of any simple TU solution.  
>  
> I'd also like to see a MT-63 hardware TU. Also, the PSK-40 is not  
> available at this time, and don't know of a simple SSB transceiver which  
> could replace it.  
>  
> Bill  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: Lyle Johnson  
> To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion  
> Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 2:45 PM  
> Subject: RE: PSK31 on PDA Device?  
>  
>  
> > Sorry for redundant bandwidth but I have come to the realization  
> > that my laptop is \*far\* too cumbersome to lug to the field and I  
> > was wondering if anyone had recommendations for smaller, lighter,  
> > kinder, gentler devices for doing PSK-31? Are there new PDAs on  
> > the market that could be used for this purpose?  
>  
> The Micro908 project from AmQRP looks like it will have a way to handle  
> PSK31 without a laptop or PDA...  
>  
> One problem with using a PDA for this sort of thing is that the CPU can't  
> sleep much if it is doing all the DSP work, so the batteries quickly  
> discharge. If a rig had a PSK31 system built in such that it  
> only needed an  
> ASCII terminal, then an old TRS80 model 100 or NEC 8201A would  
> give days of  
> battery life, or a Poqet PC would give many hours and not be too  
> cumbersome.  
>  
> 72,  
>

> Lyle KK7P

>

>

>

-----

End of QRP-L Digest 3124

\*\*\*\*\*

-----